5906

Chaukhambha Oriental Research Studies 33

NATURE OF INDIAN AESTHETICS

By

Dr. BALARAM SHRIVASTAVA

Price Rs. 100-00

5906

CHAUKHAMBHA ORIENTAL RESEARCH STUDIES
NO. 33

NATURE OF INDIAN AESTHETICS
(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ŚILPA)

BALRAM SRIVASTAVA
Reader, History of Art
Banaras Hindu Uuiversity
VARANASI

CHAUKHAMBHA ORIENTALIA
A House of Oriental and Antiquarian Books
VARANASI DELHI

Publishers :
CHAUKHAMBHA ORIENTALIA
Pos Box No. 1032
VARANASI-221001 (India)
Telephone : 63354 Telegram : Gokulosav

Branch—Bungalow Road, 9 U. B. Jawahar Nagar
(Near Kirorimal College)
DELHI-110007 Phone : 2911617

© *Chaukhambhá Orientalia*

First Edition : 1985
Price : Rs. 100-00

Elements of Indian Aesthetics Vols. I and II in five Parts,
by S. N. Ghossal Sastri Deluxe Ed. Rs. 1350-00
Ord. Ed. Rs. 750-00
Some Aspects of Social & Economic History of Ancient
India & Combodia by R. K. Chaudhary Rs. 250-00
Iconography of Śakti (A Study based on Śrī Tattvanidhi) by
Balarāma Śrīvāstava Rs. 100-00

राज्य संग्रहालय पुस्तकालय, लखनऊ
क्रमांक 5906
प्राप्ति तिथि —
State Museum, Library, Lko.

Printers—Srigokul Mudranalaya Gopal Mandir Lane, Varanasi

INTRODUCTION

In India, there is a long tradition of aesthetic studies. Modern scholars, however, have given profound and deep thoughts to the subject in relation to poetics and metaphysics. The vast *śilpa* texts have been studied from the point of view of iconography, iconometry, architecture and to some extent painting. The aesthetic aspect of the *śilpa* texts and the determination of their nature in relation to audo-visual art or the fine arts has been ignored; therefore it appears to be an imperative task. The present work is an attempt to this direction in a most humble and modest way.

Religion has been the most dominating factor of Indian art. In the chapter I. the role of religion in the determination of the nature of Indian aesthetics has been discussed with the suggestion that due to religion Indian art is set in two significant aspects, functional to suit the religious sensibility and beauty in relation to the aesthetic sensibility—the goal of both the aspects of art being the bliss (ānanda).

The poetics and metaphysics as the study of aesthetics (ch. II and ch. III) interplay significantly with their roles on discussing the elemental aspects of aesthetics and provide a sound basis for the detemination of nature of Indian aesthetics on moot points, particularly in relation to imagination and intution as the mental process of creativity, similar to the *yogic dhyāna*, determination of form (rūpa) and beauty (śobhā) and the experience (anubhūti). Foundations laid by these two important branches of aesthetics were found suitable for the framework for the determination of the nature of aesthetic material in our *śilpa* texts.

The vast material of the *śilpa* texts as presented in the non-canonical (ch. IV) and canonical literature (ch. V) preserve our art-tradition and present the aesthetic aspect as a 'physical fact', but with true and correct vision at the aesthetic situations, form, content and their relationship with beauty. They indicate two significant factors as the essentialities in achieving beauty through the material medium. One is *lakṣaṇa* and the other is *prajñā*. The *lakṣaṇas* conditioned by *māna* bring proportion, symmetry, harmony, sublimity, even the identity and imitation. The *prajñā* which should be inherent in the artist and has been defined by Vāmana as the power of ever-new creativeness (prajñā nava-navollekhana śālini) is constituted according to Rājaśekhara by *śakti* (genius), *pratibhā* (imaginative intution), *vyutpatti* (culture) and *abhyāsa* (practice). By the factor of *pratibhā* an artist not only visualizes beauty but creates beauty in the things of art.

The various treatises on painting are discussed in the chapter VI. Here, an attempt has been made to present the subject in a coherent manner related with the form, the content, the material, the technique and other related matters of the principles of traditional Indian painting. Our theorists have remarkably indicated the essential unity of all arts together with the suggestion that not only the arts but the various *vidyās* have the interlinkedness among themselves. In relation to painting it has been boldly asserted that the rules of dance and drama are the source of the rules of painting.

My approach to 'Form' and 'Similitude' (ch. VII) is to indicate how there were various ways of realizing the 'form' and achieving its end as 'Similitude' in relation to an image. Not considering the iconographic aspects, I have located the standards for imitation (anukṛti) in relation to 'Similitude' (sādṛśyatā)—one *darpaṇe pratibimbavat* or *yathārūpa* and the other visualization of 'form' through the mental process of *dhyāna*, *bhāva* and *kalpanā*. The *lokavṛttānusaraṇa* or *lokānukṛti* has been recommended by the *Śāstric* precepts from Bharata to Viśvanātha as the key-note to the principles of 'form' and 'Similitude'.

The last chapter (VIII) is devoted to the concept of beauty and the aesthetic experience. Realizing, it is better to feel beauty than to speculate on beauty, the various suggestions in relation to beauty of the ancient theorists have been evaluated here not only in relation to 'object' but also in the terms of experience. The aesthetic experience has various levels-from pleasantness and tasty on worldly level to *lokottara* on mystic level. But here the aesthetic experience is considered mostly under the concept of *rasa*. It is clearly indicated that the aesthetic experience in terms of *rasa* though higher than usual experience, of pleasure and pain is actually the identity of one's own experience, which is reflected in the fact of art.

Aesthetic instinct is deeply seated in human nature. Therefore our traditional speculations about the aesthetic elements find occassional commonness with the aesthetic speculations in the West. Where the suitable occassions are distinct, I have attempted to locate seemblance of thought between Indian thinkers and the thinkers of the West. Being the universality of aesthetic experience as the most significant feature, it serves as a bridge, not only in the thinkers of the East and the West but also a binding factor among the all arts.

I am glad to offer my heartfelt thanks and blessing to M/S. Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi, for accepting this book and bringing it out so nicely. The sincere service of Dr. L. M. Tiwari, the editor of Chaukhambha Orientalia, is thankfull appreciated for bringing out the work successfully.

Balram Srivastava

15 Agust, 1985

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION III

I. Religion as a determinant of Indian Aesthetics 1-12

II. Role of poetics in Indian Aesthetics ... 13-27

III. Metaphysical Concepts of Indian Aesthetics ... 29-47

IV. Nature of Aesthetics in Non Canonical Literature 49-76

V. Nature of Aesthetics in Canonical Literature 77-104

VI. Theories of Painting 105-131

VII. Form and Similitude 133-157

VIII. Concept of Beauty and Aesthetic Experience ... 159-190

Index 191

I

Religion as a determinant of Indian Aesthetics

Nature of Indian Aesthetics is a changing concept, hence investigation into Indian aesthetics has to be made from the point of view of its historical development and its elemental facets. In latter aspect some factors grow as common denominations in the entire arena of evolution, but some are introduced by scholars and rhetoricians as special features of Indian aesthetics. Scholastic aesthetics has been postulated in terms of experience and practical prescriptions. Both have, behind them a vast literary tradition of poetics and *śilpa śāstras.*

Since the creation of beauty or perception of beauty is the natural impulse of man, the understanding or even evaluation of beauty, which is the result of theoretical impulse, is also almost of the same antiquity. In other words, both are the consequential results of the same aesthetic situation. One however is related to creation and the other more or less with recreation. Therefore, the history of Indian aesthetics, such as elsewhere, begins after the first realisation of beauty, whether in nature or in human creation. Beauty in nature has certainly inspired man to create the things of beauty, even in the pre-historic days, at the eve of human consciousness in relation to Nature. And since the same days, the relation of Man and the Nature has been very intimate throughout the history of art. As a matter of fact, the first consciousness of Man revealed the situation that his survival depends on two facts—the fact of Nature or the fact of Art. The fact of art in its primary meaning covers the whole human effort which the Man has created for his good and happiness—the two significant elements of Indian aesthetics. But the primary quest of Indian aesthetics is beauty.

Indian aesthetics in its primary meaning can be described as the investigation of beauty in human creation. The good of Indian art and aesthetics quite naturally has been interpreted variously but the most of misunderstandings in relation to the perception of nature of Indian art and aesthetics is the general notion that the arts in India have been the handmaids of religion. Consequently, therefore, the aesthetic implications of Indian religio-philosophical idealism has been considered as the disguise, rather simply a way of illustrating the central truth of religion and philosophy.

At the present state of the study of the nature and spirit of Indian aesthetics in relation to *śilpa* or even in relation to the three main forms of *śilpa*—architecture, image-making and painting, not much can be said against this misnomerous concept of Indian art, particularly in view of the vast bulk of material relating to *śilpa* forming the significant part of our religious scriptures such as Purāṇas, Āgamas and the like. The idea of spiritual and mystically religious nature of indian art and aesthetics is further confirmed by a class of technical literature on the art of making cult—icons devoted to all major religious system of India —Brahminical, Buddhist and Jain. The religion was utilised in the total development of Indian culture and art-heritage totally mingled with our traditional values and consequently valuation rather re-valuation of our artistic heritage was made through the values and ideals, established by our religious and philosophical systems. 'Will to create' was not considered as the basis of all artistic creations, but 'dictates of religion was accepted as in the root of artistic urge.

Predominant notion of religion and spirituality had its spell on the master minds of East and West, who had concern with Indian art and aesthetics and viewed art and culture of the country basically religious and spiritual in character. Fundamentally idealistic and transcendental in attitude and approach, that all intellectual, emotional and aesthetics expressions of the Indian mind and senses originated in the sublime speculative thought of the Vedas, the Upanishadas and Gītā or in the teachings of Buddha, and that the essence of the Indian imagination and intellect was to be found in the symbols and motifs reared up by the religious and spiritual yearnings of the Indian people. What naturally followed from this was the conviction that Indian aesthetics had its origin in a transcendental philosophy, that forms of Indian art had their birth in spiritual contemplation, that its significance lay not in their formal values but in their allegorical or symbolic meaning.[1] Havell and A. K. Coomarswami realising the urge of

Indian nation and nationalism attempted to justify this kind of character of Indian art and aesthetics and pleaded before the Western mind for the recognision of the spiritual, idealistic and symbolical basis of Indian art, aesthetics and culture as a whole. Their basic assumptions are that the Indian aesthetics, is based on the doctrines, prescriptions and conventions of religions, transcendental and intellectual in character and idealistic in aim and purpose.

Such postulates led to the high degree discussions, of purely intellectual and philosophical nature, for which ready material was provided from Indian poetics and dramaturgy. Different schools of philosophic thoughts of India also were explored to find out light on some of the vital points of aesthetics, such as 'beauty'. Relevant speculations were proposed, sometimes, comparable with pre-Hegelian thoughts, under the various philosophic concepts relating to three prominent aesthetic schools of philosophy, namely (1) *Rasa-Brahma-vāda,* (2) *Nāda-Brahma-vāda* and (3) *Vāstu-Brahma-vāda.*[2] The concepts of *Nāda-Brahma* and *Vāstupuruṣa* have deep theoretical impact on the evolution of philosophical postulates in Indian aesthetics. The transcendentality of aesthetic sensibility was in some cases eulogised to a high philosophical systems of India relating the elemental aspects of Indian aesthetics with basic philosophical principles such as the *trī-tattavas, pañchakośās, pañcha-mahābhūtas,* the concept of supra-sensibility in relation to aesthetic pleasure which was occassionally equated with *Paramānanda* or *Brahmānanda*, so on and soforth. Such theorists pleaded human beauty, even the beauty in Nature as *Māyā* and the real search for beauty was considered fruitful in terms of 'Absolute Beauty' which is mystically the total of broken hints and suggestions and calls of the Divine-oversoul to the human-soul.[3]

This state of affair is not only the result of direct philosophical quest of beauty in recent times, but probably was related with certain primary metaphysical and epistimological generalisations. In view of such theorists the most fundamental of aesthetic concepts, on the analogy of spiritual concept was the realisation of *paramānanda* (supreme bliss), which is the innermost love of being, affirmed again and again both by the Indian aestheticians and the Indian theologists as well as the scholastic philosophers. In such dogmatic speculations the bliss itself is recognised as *Brahma.* The realisation of bliss is the realisation of *Brahma* and the knowing of *Brahma* in turn is the knowing of bliss itself (Ānando Brahmeti vyajñāt, *Taittiriya Upanishad* III 6). Again the same text says 'He is *Rasa.* Having obtained Him, the soul becomes full of bliss' (Raso vai rasam. Hevaam labdhvā-nandibhavati : ibid II 7). Here it is clearly stated that aesthetic pleasure is analogous to *rasa* is nothing else than the realisation of God Himself yielding bliss (ānanda) to a *rasika* and a devotee likewise placing both on the same plane of sensibility and reception.

This is not something extra-ordinary with Indian aesthetics. This has happened in the West in the pre-renaissance philosophy of Western aesthetics and also in the relationship of art and religion in the Western world. Herbert Read analysing the situation in the West remarks 'The relation between art and religion is one of the most difficult questions that we have to face. We look back into the past and see art and religion emerged hand in hand from the dim recesses of pre-history. For many centuries they seem to remain indissolutely linked, and then in Europe about five hundred years ago, the first sign of a definite breach appear. It widens, and with the High Renaissance we have an art essentially free and independent, individualistic in its origins, and aiming to express nothing beyond the artists own personality'.[4]

In all ancient arts no isolation between art and religion is possible to see—rather it can be said that there seems to be no great art or great periods of art without an intimate link between art and religion. Not only in case of Indian art we have periods and phases such as Buddhist, Jain, Brahmanical etc. but in the history of Europe also we have such periods such as Christian art etc. Hegel, in relation to the history of European art has concluded that art logically proceeds religion in the final triadic manifestation of Absolute Spirit. Further, in qualifying the relationship of art, religion and philosophy he has determined that art is thesis, religion is antithesis and philosophy is synthesis. This kind of Hegealion triadic has received various challanges and criticism since the time of his own to Croce and after. But the basic fact about the religion remains that 'even where great artists have created their masterpieces in apparent isolation from any religious faith, the more closely we look into their lives and more likely we are to discover the presence of what we can call religious sensibility'.[5]

Gods in every religion and period are primarily the artistic concepts on the basis of phenomena of Nature. Vedic poets invariably transformed Nature into god and artistically conceived about their physical forms, which were also recognised as the objects of religious sensibility.

Most prominent figures of mythology have proceeded from personifications of the most striking natural phenomena. The names of Sūrya (sun), Soma (moon), Agni (fire), Dyaus (sky), Maruts (storms), Vāyu (wind) etc. indicate the transformation of Nature to art in form of divinities conceived physically beautiful. At the same time it should be clearly understood that the role of religion in art, particularly in the determination of iconographic forms and subject matter is significant. The aesthetic experience and religious mystic experiences are radically different and rarelly coincide. It is an anamoly that while the intensity of religious sensibility in art, testify the intensity of religious sensibility of a community, the values of respective religions do not determine the degree of the artistic sensibility and achievements of that artistic community. This shows the independence as well as inter-dependence of nature of art and religion.

The ritualists, however, make clear-cut distinction between an usual art-object and a cult object. By simply adopting a religious theme or form, the art-object may not be acceptable to religion and worship. Those which receive religious sanction, ritually consecrated are the only art-objects adopted into the service of religion. The *prāṇa pratiṣṭhā, vāstupūjā* etc. are the known rituals in India for the images and temples etc. Such ritualistic consecreations, while enhance the religious merits of art, do not effect the aesthetic aspect of art. Their function is to evoke and constantly re-evoke, certain emotions whose discharge is to effect in the activities of everyday life through hymns and ceremonies.[6]

The fact remains, neither art is religion nor religion is art. There is fundamental difference between the two. The religious experience is a permanent state of being, aesthetic experience is a transcendent one occassioned by an object and there is no knowing how long the experience would abide. This may improve sensibility (ātmānaṁ saṁkurute), but may not develop essentially the religious character, particularly, outwardly. 'Aesthetic experience leads to a state of being of pure delight (rasa) in the world of name and form; religious and spititual experience leads to a state of being of total liberation (mokṣha, nirvāṇa) from the bondage of the world of name and form. The ultimate effects are therefore poles apart'.[7]

Sensibility towards religion does not mean isolation of perception of Indian life and society, which was really very comprehensive. The Indian thoughts and ways of life if idealistic in one system, there were scope for materialism in the systems of Lokāyats, Chārvākins etc. Duality in various aspects of Indian life and culture cannot be denied. The magnificant richness of our art heritage itself is a pointer to our multifacet achievements, not only in field of art and religion, but in the fields from mathematics to engineering. The human sensibilities regarding space, rhythem balance, proportion, harmony, line, volume, similitude, grace, emotions, forms etc. were no less in India than elsewhere.[8] Ignoring this broad spectrum of Indian life, art and aesthetics, which are based on experiences of human passions, feelings, and emotions are expressed in terms of universal human sensibility, it is curious that scholars have given undue emphasis on the sectarian dogmas; their *mantras*, *dhyānas*, *sādhanās*. They deal, as a matter fact, the external nature and outline of art rather than the inner nature of Indian aesthetics.

But when the philosophies and religions of India were alive with vitality, serious thought were given to the problems of art and aesthetics. Certain philosophical systems of India, besides the Vedic and Upaniṣadic contemplations took the common issues related with aesthetic and metaphysics in particular and spirituality in general. The nature of information is, however casual or analogical in Vedic literature, but in the developed systems of philosophies—Brahmanical or Buddhists, the discussions on the problems relating to *chitta*, *dhyāna*, *sādṛśya*, *anukṛti*, *ābhāṣa*, *ramaṇīyatā*, *rasa*, *ānanda* etc. have been given serious attention.

Perception and experience leading to bliss are the main items of discussion in the different systems of philosophies. The modes and the forms of perception has been a matter of controversy due to the primary nature of the quest in relation to this problem in different philosophies. Lokāyats and Chārvākins determined the perception of beauty and the basic [condition of bliss as what is *pratyakṣa* i e., what is perceptible to eyes or enjoyed by the senses directly. In Jainism and Buddhism *anumāna*, (inference) was also accepted as an instrument of perception. In the Nyāya system of philosophy, for the perception of an image or object, besides the above two *upamāna* (comparison or resemblence) and *śabda* (word) were also considered necessary. Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy gave emphasis on the seven elemental *padārtha-dravya, guṇa, karma, sāmānya, viśeṣa, samavāya* and *abhāva* as essential for knowledge and perception. All these were presented in more tangible way in the philosophic system of Sāṅkhya. In this system perception is reduced to sensibility i.e., knowing (bodha) through senses or sensual contact (indriya-sannikarśa). Knowledge or reflection is received by *chitta* (mind). If the reception (pratyabhijñyā) produces favoured effect it causes bliss in the mind (anukūlavedanīyaṁ sukhaṁ). If the sensual perception is adverse (pratikūla) it causes *duḥkha*-misery. These two perceptions are everyday matter and worldly and comes within the perview of aesthetics. But the third kind of experience which is absolute (kevala), pure (śuddha) and detached (pramocchya) is beyond the perview of aesthetics and the subject matter of spiritual experience as its goal is withdrawal (pratyāhāra). This withdrawal produces lasting effect on the pure mind (śuddha chitta) and leads to *paramānanda, sahaja, mahāsukha, nirvāṇa*, so on and soforth. It is also infinite. But the aesthetic pleasure is not so supra-sensual. It is allusion (māyā) and has transitory effect on *chitta*.

The process of the perception, reception, and reflection (pratibiṁbana) can be explained summarily as follows and can be named as reflectionism or 'pratibimbavāda'.

The contact of senses with the subject causes direct perception. The perception reflects the *manas* or *chitta* and the inter-action of the two—sense *indriya* and *manas* effect the mind (buddhi) and receives a form. The degree of reflection on mind depends on the degree of purity or (sātvikatā) of mind. In the mind, with pure *sattva guṇa* or *śuddha buddhi* the reflection of *'Puruṣa'* who is *chaitanya*, is produced and the mind is enlightened, which results ultimately in the identity of 'Prakṛti' or 'Puruṣa' or 'Jaḍa' and 'Chetana', 'Ātman' and 'Paramātman'. The complete unism is the cause of *mokṣha* which is supreme bliss (paramānanda), which is in terms of Indian aesthetics is *pratibimbitānanda* (reflected bliss) or the aesthetic enjoyment born of *atmānanda* (ātmānadasamudbhava, Daśarūpaka, IV. 43).

Some philosopher-aestheticians claim that the bliss of art is of the same genus as the bliss of the soul. They plead that it is creative of the essence of self-dependent, and so intense as to shut out all other intruding lower pleasure or pain. This state of aesthetic experience is described by Mammaṭa as 'vigalitvedyāntaramānandam'. Śaṁkarāchārya commenting on the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, defines *rasa* as satisfaction, which is the cause of *ānanda*' 'Rasonāma triptiheturānandakaro'. In this way he has attempted to carry or elevate the *rasa* of the physical realm comparable to pleasarable tastes like sweet and sour etc. (madhurāmlādiprasiddho loke) to the super-physical realm in the mental pleasure of aesthetic realisation and also in the supra-mental pleasure of metaphysical realisation.

This is the example of one of the attempts by which the philosophers or metaphysical aestheticians have exalted a *rasa* of ordinary experience to ultimate bliss (Brahmānanda etc.). Jagannātha feels that this kind of experience is an unworldly affair (alaukika vyāpāra). But he has made distinction between the two sets of experiences of pleasure or bliss. In the aesthetic experience the bliss of the soul is coloured and thereby obscured by *rati* etc. (sthāyībhāvas of Indian poetics), which are feelings and emotional states experienced in many births, whereas in spritual experience of bliss the soul shines forth as it is an unfragmented and unobscured and ultimately leads to liberation.[9]

But as stated above, the object of aesthetic experience of divine *rasa* or 'Rasa-Brahma' as exalted primarly by Saṁkara is something unworldly analogous to *chidānanda* or *sukhamatyāntika* and beyond the experiences of senses. Therefore the whole approach of metaphysical of philosophic aestheticians is something far from the goal of art. Spiritual realisation is the realisation of a mystic *sādhaka* and not of a *rasika*. The aesthetic pleasure cannot be intellectually contemplated, but to be lived through, for, it is the human being who is receptable to all kinds of experiences—actual and imaginative.

A. K. Coomarswami has never failed to see the two significant aspects of Indian art and aesthetics—one utiliterian (vyāpāra-mātra) and the other 'abhidhā-lakṣya'. The latter is related with emotional and intellectual mode of being (manomaya kośa). Forms of things to be made are ordered (prativihita) to these ends and that the knowledge of their right determination (pramāṇa) proceeds from a condition of consciousness in which the artist is fully identified with (samādhi, tadākāratā) the theme of work to be done.[10]

The two aspects of art-experience are connected with two sets of people-consumer (bhogin) and spectator (draṣṭā) An adequate and intelligent use of the work of art is by whom who understands its determinations; and finally, that which distinguishes the work of art from a natural object.

In both the ways the art has been accepted by him in relation to a compitent spectator as a source of delight (ānanda), which is ultimately transcedent with respect to any or all of the specific pleasures or meanings conveyed by the work itself. That delight is felt when the ideal beauty (rasa) of the work is seen or tested in pure aesthetic experience. The delight of ideal beauty (rasāsvādana), though void of contact with intelligible things (vedyāntara–sparśaśūnya), is in the intellectual ecstatic order of being (ānanda-chinamaya), transcedental (lokottara), indivisible (akhaṇḍa), self-manifest (svaprakāśa) like a flash of lighting (chamatkāra), the very twin of the tasting of Brahman (Brahmāsvāda-sahodara).[11]

This delight is unconditional. It cannot be determined by any ethical quality, nor even by theme of purpose. Even meaning also is secondary incident. It is only by way of an imaginative integration of oneself with the meaning and theme (artha-bhāvanā) etc. that the delight is achieved and enjoyed. *Daśarūpaka* has at length explained the significance of *artha-bhāvanā svādaḥ*.[12]

References

1. Niharranjan Ray, *An Approach to Indian Art*, pp. 13–14
2. K. C. Pandey, *Comparetive Aesthetics*, Vol. II, p. 2.
3. K. S. R. Shastri, *Indian Aesthetics*, p. 7.
4. Herbert Read, *Meaning of Art*, pp. 60-62.
5. Ibid., p. 61.
6. R. G. Collingwood, *Principles of Art*, p. 72.
7. *An Approach to Indian Art*, p. 203.
8. Ibid., p. 20.
9. *Rasagaṅgādhara*, quoted in *India Aestheties*, p. 197.
10. Coomarswami : Selected Papers, Ed. by Roger Lipsey. 1977. (Princeton) Vol. I. pp. 92–93.
11. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 2–3.
12. *Daśarūpaka*, IV. 85.

II

Role of poetics in Indian Aesthetics

The above discussed postulates suggesting elemental unity of art represent the true nature of Indian aesthetics. In poetics, *vāk* and *artha* are perfectly assimilated (samprikta) to express the poetic beauty. But on the practical level, without denying the above truths, the nature of judgement in relation to aesthetics vary very much in Sanskrit poetics. Ānandavardhana gave special regards to grammar, i.e. the correctness of speech (expression). But it is a sort of normative factor in aesthetic experience. In formal qualities of art certain rules are to be obeyed. But with the growth of Sanskrit poetics as an independent discipline, independent branches of aesthetic speculations came in to vogue, leaving behind a vast literature. P. V. Kane in the introduction of 'Sāhitya Darpaṇa' has given a list of 872 treatises on aesthetics. All such works mostly deal with the working rules of poetic composition, means of external production into an exact system, occassionaly mathematical formulas and rigid catagories, inner experience by way of *rasotpādana* as well as *rasānubhūti* and poetic embelishment (alaṁkāra). Some of these have theoretical applicability to all arts. Though, intimately connected and concerned with each other, the whole system of poetic-aesthetics is grouped mainly into two schools *rasa* and *dhvani*. *Rasa* has been considered as the primary factor of Indian aesthetics and its theoretical authorship is ascribed to Bharata. It is however, to be clearly understood that while in Bharata *rasa* is a whole dramaturgical process, leading to '*siddhi*', 'Abhinavagupta' propounded it as in terms of aesthetic experiance. To him the experience of *rasa* is neither mysterious nor metaphysical. The *siddhi* of Bharata is not exactly the experience of *rasa* of Abhinavagupta. They are two separate entities.

In the middle of the 9th century *rasa* theory of Indian poetics was rather overwhelmed by the theory of *dhvani* propounded by Ānandavardhana, the author of 'Dhvanyāloka'. The exponents of *dhvani* school in their analysis of poetry found that the contents of good poem (same may be true to other arts also) may generally be distinguished as either that which is expressed and includes what is given in so many words or that which is not expressed, but must be added by the imagination of the reader, listner (looker, spectator etc.). The unexpressed or suggested part, which is distinctly linked up with the expressed and which is developed by a peculiar process of suggestion (vyañjanā) is the soul or essence of poetry (art). The unexpressed, through the suggestive power of word or idea may be unexpressed thought or matter (vastu) or an unexpressed figure of speech (alaṁkāra), but in most cases it is a mood or feeling (rasa) which is unexpressible directly. The *dhvani* school took up the moods and feelings as an element of the unexpressed and tried to harmonise the idea of *rasa* with the theory of *dhvani*.[1] The central theme of 'Dhvanyāloka' is in the attention around the fact that words which are the material of poetry, used in a certain way possess the power to evoke aesthetic emotion and not merely symbols for the conveying of fact in a literal manner.[2] This was an important discovery. This analysis has pointed out two fold functions of language—logical and suggestive, really introduced a new level of discussion. The fundamental difference in the pre-Ānandavardhana and post-Ānandavardhana theory of aesthetics, however, may be understood that Bharata, Daṇḍin, Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa and Saṅkuka while defined the essence of art in clear-cut terms, Ānandavardhana and his followers stressed on the inexpressible qualities of a good art. The essence of poetry (art) he hold, lay not in its representational or descriptive qualities, but in the suggestion (vyañjanā) of the emotional mood (bhāva). Not the formal structure, but the intangible inexpressible quality is significant in the realm of art. This theory of *dhvani* may be compared with the referential theory of meaning, propounded by Abraham.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka (in the Hṛdayadarpaṇa) a contemporary of Ānandavardhana gave a new dimension to the aesthetic contemplation by propounding the theory of 'generalised state of aesthetic consciousness. This freed the aesthetic experience from the illusionary condition of aesthetic suggestion and placed the aesthetic experience on an universal, plane conditioned by the causal relationship.

5906

Both, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Ānandavardhana, made deep impression on Abhinavagupta, who built a comprehensive theory of pure feeling (of delight = Rasa). Undisturbed by rational considerations, his singular contribution lies in freeing the artistic consciousness from all natural and practical relationship and in investing it with meaning and positive value, lying not in any end outside but wholly within the work itself[3] (svarūpa svalakṣaṇa). Thus, he has suggested the complete identification in the art work and the aesthetic emotion. This identity invariably accompanied by the greatest joy (ānanda) reflects the true character of *rasa.* At this point, it is significant to note that Abhinavagupta[4] did not take much depart and accepted a sort of identification between the Upaniṣadic theory of *ānanda* as could be achieved by *ātman* and the *ānanda* as the consequence of aesthetic experience (rasāsvādana). To him both the delights—aesthetic and metaphysical were the twins (Brahmānandasahodaram). Thereby he attributed the ethical value to the aesthetic experience defined in terms of *rasa,* and considered as instrumental for the transforming the personality of individual (ātmānam saṁkurute). The artistic experience of *ānanda* as compared to *Brahmānanda,* however differs; that while in the latter experience there is state of permanency and complete detachment, artistic creative experience affords only a temporary release from the ills of life by enabling one to transcendent, for the moment, personal relations of practical interests. It restores equanimity of mind (viśrānti), which is not only the result of the aesthetic experience, but it is one of the tests of its success. It is also to be clearly understood that though the aesthetic experience of bliss (ānanda) in relation to the realisation of spiritural bliss is less infinite and less immortal, it is also not to be compared with ordinary and day to day sensual pleasure, in which there is the elements of selfishness of impulse and shortness of duration.

We have referred to above the theory of generalisation and universality propounded by Bhaṭṭanāyaka (900 A.D.). He drew attention of theorists to the generalised state of aesthetic consciousness, arising from illusionary situation and leading to universality as well as eliminating particular subjective state. Aesthetic experience, he pointed out for the first time, marks a definite breaks with the world which is dominated and conditioned by the law of cause and effect.

Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa may be understood in the sense of broadening of emotional range, or generalisation. In this school of aesthetic speculation emotions (bhāva) are the most vital element of art. The theorists pleaded that emotions exist in the mind of the *sahṛdaya* in the form of latent impressions (vāsanā), derived from actual experiences of life or from inherited instinct.[5] The latent emotions are suggested by the depicted factors which when presented in the generalised form, cease to be ordinary causes but became extra-ordinary causes. The factors being generalised or impersonalised by the suggestive power of word or senses do not refer to particular, but to general. The particular individual, while relishing art does not think that it his own personal emotion, but of all persons of similar sensibility.

Thus by generalisation (sādhāraṇīkaraṇa) is meant the process of idealisation by which a reader (in the context of *kāvya*) passes from his troublous personal emotion to the serenity of contemplation of a poetic sentiment. The poet as well as the audience must possess this capacity of idealisation; otherwise he will never be able to present personal emotion as an impersonal poetic sentiment capable of being relished by others.[6] The resulting relish, S. K. De observes, is neither pain nor pleasure in the natural sense, which is found in the ordinary emotions of life associated with personal interests, but a relish dissociated from all such interest, consisting of pure joy, free from contact of everything else perceived but itself. An ordinary emotion (bhāva) may be pleasurable (rasa), transcending the limitations of the personal attitude, is lifted above such pain and pleasure into pure joy.[7]

The most happy situation of the poetic realisation in relation to the postulates of 'Ultimate Principles' of Indian aesthetics may be seen in the distinction between aesthetic experience of bliss and the spiritual experience of bliss. It is however, to be noted that in both, there is difference, but not any conflict. Similarly, there is perfect co-existence between the relationship of the postulates of ultimate principles of aesthetics (in the concept of *rasa, dhvani* etc.) and outward technique of artistic creation, Formalists, sometimes in exaggerated degree, emphasize on systematization and on external production. Some of such theorists were genius, and some were mere technicians. Most of the formalists were less imaginative hence, gave greater stress on physical facts than on poetic (creative) intution.[8] Against too much systematization Ānandavardhana did a bold declaration that the ways of expressions are infinite (anantā hi vāgvikalpaḥ). Since there is no end of poetic individualisations, it is futile to elaborate rhetorical or qualitative catagories.

Abhinavagupta (middle of 10th Century A. D.) who advocated the theory of *dhvani* as the essence of poetry, also gave importance to word and sense (śabdārthaśarīram kāvyam, Dhvanyāloka, I. 5). In the same text (śloka 7) the traditional theory of the formalists is also mentioned that the significance of word and sense (meaning) lies alongwith quality (guṇa) and embelishment (alaṁkāra). *Śabda* here has much more different significance than what is in the usual language, in the form of logic and grammar. *Śabda* having the power of producing different kinds of meaning is the chief concern of the formalists. A word has not only its denotive (abhidhā) sense but also has its indicative (lakṣaṇā) sense and its suggested (vyañjanā) sense. As stated above, the *dhvani* theoriests add much significance to *vyaṅgyārtha* (the suggested sense) particularly because it transcends the *vāchyārtha* (the expressed sense). But Ānandavardhana, who gave much emphasis to word and said that all senses are intensified (guṇībhūta), all other senses are subordinated to the expressed sense (vāchyārtha).

Rīti school was a logical outcome of the efforts of those who regarded word itself as the pivot of all poetic achievements. *Rīti*, commonly stood for 'style', may be described as a particular kind of formal arrangement of words (in poeties). Daṇḍin (first half of 8th century and Vāmana 800 A. D.) were the powerful proponents to this literay movement.

Rīti, *vṛtti* and *mārga* are considered sometime same as. style. But *rīti* commonly is taken for style, *vṛtti* for diction, which is mother of poetry and grouped into four special types—Bhāratī, Kaiśikī, Sāttavatī, and Ārbhati. *Mārga* is understood for dictum.[9]

Daṇḍin declared that speech is diversified in the mode of expression and in most cases he has successfully showed the distinction, but ultimately reduced the expression in two *rītis* Vaidarbhī and Gauḍī. Vāmana adding to these types the third one namely Pañchālī, affirmed that *rīti* is the soul of poetry (rītyātmā kāvyasya). In his 'Kāvyālaṁkāra Sūtra' (1.2.8) he explained *rīti* as *viśiṣṭapadarachanā rītiḥ* and its value is stressed as the special quality of poetic creation (viśeṣoguṇātmā).

Subsequent theorists of this school add some other styles of poetry namely, *Lāṭī*, *Avantikā* and *Māgadhī*. It is significant that all the above mentioned poetic styles though have special poetic diction and marked by certain peculiar form of arrangement of *padas*, they essentially represent the poetic speciality of regions denoted by the name itself. Such distinctions are also to be found in music and may be investigated in other forms of visual arts. But in poetics such generalisations put a serious scholastic barrier against the validity of individual expression It also fails to refer the organic activity of poetic intentions. Same can be said about the theorists who pleaded the validity of *guṇas*. They are more pedantic and scholastic and less relevant to poetic intution. But such speculative catagorization is popular in poetics as well as in the *Śilpa Śāstras*.

The theory of *rīti* has close affiliation with the theory of *guṇa* (quality or excellences). The *alaṁkāra* theorists also considered the poetic excellence (guṇa) for some of their *alaṁkāra* types. Daṇḍin took excellence as the main constituent of *mārga* and *rīti*. To illustrate, he said Vaidarbhī *mārga* or *rīti* is costituted by the ten *guṇas*. These ten *guṇas* finds first mention in the Bharatas 'Nāṭyaśāstra'. Here, the aesthetic consideration is made in relation to four poetic figures (alaṁkāras), ten poetic excellences (guṇas), ten defects (doṣas) and thirty six characteristics (lakṣaṇās). The ten *guṇas* enumerated by Daṇḍin are as follows :—

'Śleṣa (compactness), prasāda (clearness), Samatā (smoothness), mādhurya (sweetness), sukumāratā (softness), arthavyakta (explicitness), udāratva (elevation), ojas (forcefulness), kānti (brightness) and samādhi (metaphorical expression).

Vāmana also accepted the above mentioned ten *guṇas* as the essential constituents of Vaidarbhī. He determined that Gauḍī excels in *ojas* and *kānti* and Pañchālī is full of *mādhurya* and *saukumārya.*

Vāmana thus, explained that *rīti* is the resultant of the union of *guṇas* or literary excellence, He however, declared that the poetic excellence is not confined to words only (ten śabdaguṇas), but also to sense and meaning (ten arthaguṇas). Upon this the *guṇavādi* theorists remained divided for long. Some considered *guṇas* relevant to *śabda,* some in relation to *artha* only and still some took it as relevant in the case of both. Daṇḍin explained that some *guṇas* are relevant in case of words and some *guṇas* are in the case of meaning only. For example, *śleṣa* is *śabdaguṇa* and *prasāda* is *arthaguṇa.* The concept of ten *guṇas* relevant to both-*śabda* and *artha,* was supported by Bharata, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and to some extent by Abhinavagupta also.

As against the ten *guṇas* theory, Bhāmaha (in Kavyālaṁkāra), Ānandavardhana (in Dhvanyāloka) have specified only three *guṇas—ojas, prasāda* and *mādhurya.* Probably there were two schools of the *guṇa* theory—one approving ten *guṇas* and the other reducing ten *guṇas* to three only. Mammaṭa in 'Kavyaprakāśa' made a bold attack on the theory of ten *guṇas.*

Some of the *alaṁkāras* are hardly distinguishable from some of the *guṇas* of the *rīti* school. Vāmana says that the *guṇas* are the causes of poetic charm (kavyaśobhaḥ kartāro dharmaḥ) and the *alaṁkāras* enhance the charm of the *guṇas* (tad-atiśayahetavaḥ). Thus, his view is that the *rīti* based on *guṇas* is the soul of poetry whereas *alaṁkāras* are the jewels decorating the body of poetry.

Bharata has referred to ten poetic defects (doṣas). Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha also have given the list of *doṣas.* They may be listed as follows:—

1. *Padadoṣa* (faulty words) 2. *Padāṁśa doṣa* (faulty sylables), 3. *Vākya doṣa* (faulty sentence), 4. *Artha doṣa* (faulty sense). To this *rasadoṣa* and *viparyaya* are also added.

Doṣas are the secondary topic of all *alaṁkāravādī* theorists, except Udbhaṭa and has been analysed along with the *guṇas* as counterparts of poetic virtue and vice. Later it was considered in parity with figure or embelishment rather than in the context of qualities or *guṇas*. S. K. De considering the nature of *guṇa* and *doṣa*, determined that they are to be considered in relation to successful and unsuccessful expressions. They are also the determinants of poetic beauty and poetic ugliness.[10] The successful expression is more significant than the scholastic definitions of *guṇas* or *doṣas*.

Poetic defects and poetic impropriety are two things. The latter is great hinderance in *rasāsvādana* as well as it greatly violates the procedural sequence of creation. The consideration of *auchitya* is made in relation to the use of words as well as in the higher concepts of poetic intution. But more seriously, *anauchitya* (impropriateness) is considered by the theorists than *auchitya* (propriety). In 'Vyaktiviveka' (150-154), Mahimbhaṭṭa has given greater attention to the theory of *anauchitya* and pointed out that this flaw can be formal (vahiraṅga) as well as internal (antaraṅga). Or it may be grouped in to two-relating to words (śabda) and relating to meaning (artha). They have also been elaborately discussed by Ānandavardhana. Mahimabhaṭṭa, (vyaktiviveka II) classifies *anauchitya* into five types :—

1—Vidheya vimarṣa—giving subordinate significance to principal subjects (vastu).

2—Prakramabheda—it is related with the improper use of words or use of words in improper sequences or unsymmetrical expression.

3—Kramabheda—to use proper noun (sarvanāma) first without mentioning the noun (sajñā). Exp. in '*trīthe tadiya*' the latter word is due to *kramabheda* for before *tadiye* the word Gaṅgā has not occurred, for which *tadiye* is used.

4—Paunaruktya—it refers to the repetition of one and the same thought and phrases. Mahimabhaṭṭa has especially noticed it in the context of repetition of emotion and ideas. Akṣapāda had seen the *punaruktyadoṣa* in relation to *śabda* and *artha* both (śabdārthayoḥ punarvachanam punaruktam-anyatranuvādāt).

5—Vāchyā vachana—To make an expression quite in ultra situation.

In the dramaturgy, the concept of *anauchitya* has been relatively much usefully considered, more from the point of view of practical consequence than theoretical. The poetic concept of *anauchitya* does not hold much validity if a consideration is made to a good expression of beauty (śobhā) with a clear distinction to a bad or faulty expression leading to ugliness.

Now we have to observe in brief *vakrokti* (witty composition and pun) and *alaṁkāra* (embelishment or figure of speech). Bhāmaha may be regarded as the propounder of both, though the latter (alaṁkāra) may be exemplified in the pre-Bhāmaha poetry also. He, in his 'Kāvyalaṁkāra' has shown much care to external charm of the creation and attached much importance to *vakrokti*, which may be described as a fascinating indirectness and obliqueness of speech. He ignores the significance of *svābhāvokti* (natural mode of expression) to which Daṇḍin gives utmost significance. Bhāmaha at one stage considers *vakrokti* as the essence or soul of poetry, for expression in natural mode (svābhāvokti) even with *mādhurya* and *prasāda guṇas*, or with *ramaṇīyārtha* may be a good song (gīti), but not a poetry.

Kuntaka in his great work Vakroktijīvitam (in the middle of 10th century A. D.) defined *vakrokti* as charming figurative, unfamiliar expression and suggested that it is the soul of poetry (kāvyātmā). He made *vakrokti* similar to *vaichitrya*. Mahimabhaṭṭa (11th century A. D.) also favoured. *vakrokti* and attacked the concept of *dhvani* holding that the suggestive sense is only an inference from the expressed meaning through *vakrokti*. The total rebel of Kuntaka against *dhvani* and *rasa* theories and his strong support to *vakrokti* really brought poetry a thing of external embelishment. But Daṇḍin, considered *vakrokti* as an *alaṁkāra*. Kuntaka though attempted to bring up everything even the *rasa* and *dhvani* subservient to *vakrokti*, does not create any ever lasting impact on the later theorists, who gave no prominance to the *vakrakti* theory. The significance of *vakrokti* was later reduced to magical or unusual charma (chamatkāra vaidagdhya etc.).

We have pointed out earlier that though Bhāmaha is the founder of *alaṁkāra* school, the quality of poetic embelishment, (*alaṁkāra*) is the characteristic of Indian literature since early. Thus, Yāska's 'Nirukta' refers to *upamā* in the 'Vedas'. 'Vedānta Sūtras' refers to *Upamā*' and '*rūpaka*' (III. 2.18 and 1.4.1.). Pāṇini mentions *upamā* and *upameya*. But these sporadic existances do not have any direct bearing on the development of *alaṁkāra śāstra*. Bharata in his 'Nāṭyaśāstra' refers to four *alaṁkaras*. But by the time of Bhaṭṭikāvya (5th century A.D.) nearly thirty eight *alaṁkāras* were recognised and illustrated (Xth Canto). Bhāmaha, in 'Kāvyālaṁkāra', gave *alaṁkāra* theory of poetics, a solid foundation, which received attention by way of positive discussions right down to 18th century A.D. Jagannātha (Rasagaṅgādhara) and Appaya Dīkṣita were the last exponent of this theory and has discussed 132 *alaṁkāras*. The landmarks in the development of the theory may be seen in the works of Daṇḍin (Kāvyādarśa, 6th century A.D.), Udbhaṭa (Alaṁkāra Saṁgraha, 800 A.D.), Vāmana (Kāvyālaṁkāra Sūtra, 8th century A.D.), Rudraṭa (Kāvyālaṁkāra, 9th century A.D.), Rājaśekhara (Kāvyamīmāṁsā, 10th century A.D.), Mammaṭa (Kāvyaprakāśa, 11th century A.D.), Ruyyaka (Alaṁkārasarvasva, Alaṁkāramañjarī, Alaṁkārānusāriṇi, Alaṁkāravārtika etc. 12th century A.D.), Hemachandra (Alaṁkārachūḍāmaṇi, 1177A.D), Vāgbhaṭṭa, (Vāgbhaṭṭalaṁkāra, 17th century A.D.), Amarachandra (Kavitā-Rahasya, 13th century A.D.), Vidyādhara (Ekāvali, 13th century A.D.), Mallīnātha (13th century A.D.). In the same century flourished Jayadeva (Chandrāloka) and Viśvanātha (Sāhityadarpaṇa). But the last two great aestheticians, who dealt *alaṁkāra* theory also, as noted above, were Appaya Dīkṣita (16th century A.D.) and Viśvanātha. The former in his 'Kuvalayānanda' gave good treatment to *arthālaṁkāra* and the latter in his 'Sāhityadarpaṇa' gave famous aforism 'ramaṇīyārtha pratipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyaṁ'. Later aestheticians till 18th century A.D., more or less commented upon the earlier authors without much originality.

The *alaṁkāravādins* had two fold approaches to the problem of poetic embelishment. Firstly they attempted to speculate about *alaṁkāra* as an independent branch of poetics, secondaly they tried to make all other theories as subordinates to *alaṁkāra* theory. But consequently both the approaches were similar. Bhāmaha described that faultless (nirdoṣa) and embelished (sālaṁkāra) śabdārtha (sound and sense) or word and meaning is true poetry.

Neither he gave any importance to *rīti* or *mārga* nor even to *guṇas*. Daṇḍin himself has considered *guṇas* as a form of *rīti*. Bhāmaha considered *alaṁkāra* and the removal of defect as significant points. He also denied the significance of *svabhāvokti* and took *vakrokti* as a form of *alaṁkāra*. His attitude towards *rasa* was also similar when he declared that *rasvat* itself is a figure of speech. He did not consider *Vyaṅgyārtha* or *dhvani* as the life of poetry. He pleaded that *dhvani* is implied in some of the *alaṁkāras*, for example *Vyājastuti*, *Aprastuta-praśaṁsā*, *Paryāyokti*, *Samāsokti* etc. His followers, such as Udbhaṭa, Pratihārendrarāja and Rudraṭa very remarkably analised the figure of speech and divided *śabdālaṁkāras* with *Vakroti*, *Śleṣa* (paronomasia), *Chitra* (meterical force), *Aṇuprāśa* (alliteration) and *Yamaka* (rhyme) and the *arthālaṁkāra* into the broad generic group of Vāstava (reality). *Aupamya* (comparison), *Atiśaya* (exaggeration) and *Śleṣa* (commingly). Daṇḍin, on the contrary divided thirty five *alaṁkāras* into two catagories *Svabhāvokti* and *Vakroti*. Vāmana also did not attach much significance to *alaṁkāra* and equated all of them with *aupamya*. Ruyyaka grouped *alaṁkāras* into five, namely *Aupamya* (comparison), *Virodha* (contrast), Śṛṅkhalā (interlinkedness), *Nyāya* (imaginative reason) and *Gūḍhārtha pratīti* (subtle and suggestive sense). He added one group more '*Saṁkara*' (commningling of figure of speech).

Daṇḍin, who pleaded *rīti* as *ātman* of Kāvya, defined *alaṁkāra* as *Kāvya-śobhākaraḥ* He did not attach any importance to tricks of word, such as in *Yamaka*, but realised the significance of *arthālaṁkāra*, particularly *Upmā* or *Aupamya* of which he illustrated thirty two varities.

Vāmana also recognised the significance of *alaṁkāra* in the sense of beauty (Saundaryaṁ alaṁkāraḥ). He noticed that some of the *alaṁkāras* are hardly distinguishable from some of the *guṇas* of *rīti* school. In his thirty illustrations of *alaṁkāra* he geve two instances of *Śabdālaṁkāras—Yamaka* and *Anuprāśa* and pleaded that *Upamā* (simile) is the basis of all poetic figures (Upamā prapañcha).

Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha (in Sāhitya Darpaṇa) gave secondary importance to the *alaṁkāra* theory. But some good collections and discussions appeared subsequently in the works of Ruyyaka (Alaṁkāra-sarvasva), Keśava Miśra (Alaṁkāra Śekhara), Viśveśvara (Alaṁkāra Kaustubha) etc. as the last flicker of this school.

The analogy of body and soul is the frequent occurrence in Indian poetics. But the critics differ considerably in determining at to what is soul (Kāvya-ātmā) and what is body of poetry (Kāvya-Śarīra). There is much difference over emphasis and though all theorists unite in finding the alliance (sāhita) of sound (śabda) and sense (artha) as body and soul, they fight over the determination of the soul. One by one all poetic factors, such as *rīti*, *rasa*, *vakrokti*, *dhvani*, *guṇa*, *alaṁkāra* etc. have been described as soul and the rest, as physical factors (body or Kāvya-Śarīra), but this feature has emerged due to exclusive emphasis of ones own proportion. But such attempts to exalt any one of the elements at the expense or to the exclusion of the other, though a regular feature of the development of Indian poetics, it can be considered as the bold manifestation of multi-facet-charactersties of poetic aesthetics of India.

References

1. Sneh Pandit, *An Approach to the Indian Theory of Art and Aesthetics*, p. 9.
2. Ibid., p. 11.
3. For elaboration, see Ramiero Gnoli, *The Aesthietic Experience according to Abhinavagupta*, Rome, 1956.
4. *Indian Aesthetics*, pp. 15, 90.
5. *An Approach to Indian Theory* etc. p. 12.
6. Ibid., p. 12.
7. S. K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics*, pp. 12-13.
8. Ibid., p. 12.
9. S. N. Ghosal Shastri, *Elements, of Indian Aesthetics*, Vol I, p. 138.
10. *Indian Aesthetics*, p. 6.
11. Ibid., pp. 79– 0.

References

1. Sneh Pandit, *An Approach to the Indian Theory of Art and Aesthetics*, p. 8.
2. Ibid, p. 1.
3. For elaboration, see Raniero Gnoli, *The Aesthetic Experience according to Abhinavagupta*, Rome, 1956.
4. *Indian Aesthetics*, pp. 14, 91.
5. *An Approach to Indian Theory* etc. p. 12.
6. Ibid, p. 12.
7. S. K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics*, pp. 12-13.
8. Ibid, p. 13.
9. S. N. Ghosal Shastri, *Elements of Indian Aesthetics*, Vol. I, p 138.
10. *Indian Aesthetics* p. 5.
11. Ibid, pp. 79-80

III

Metaphysical Concepts of Indian Aesthetics

Aesthetic imagination is considered here not in any restricted and conventional context, but in a wide and comprehensive scope for it is, as the 'Aitereya Brāhmaṇa' suggests, in tune or harmony with Nature and is based on natural dynamism of observation and perpectual understanding of man. Primary quest in this relationship is about feeling and form and ultimately bliss (ānanda).

The primary aesthetic process begins with feeling of pleasantness (anukūla bhāvatā). Aesthetic feeling in comparision to ordinary emotional feeling and taste is a stable feeling. Other qualities of aesthetic feeling is its relevancy to object and it has applied to other also, of course in degrees. This relates to reaction to art objects. The aesthetic feeling is also a mental attitude, rather an activity of *chitta.* In Indian concept the realisation of feeling is through *dhyāna* or contemplation, which is significant in relation to object as well as in relation to practice. In creative arts only the organised feelings take the form. When form is without feeling it is merely *ākāra.* When with the product of feeling and thought the form is *rūpa*–the feeling incarnate. Such feelings which has found its incarnation (form) or taken plastic shape it cannot remain the reaction of a single mind or body. Feeling transformed into permanances, order, harmony, meaning and value, ceases to be a mere self-absorption. It has its reactions to others also. Thus aesthetic feeling inherits three properties—'permanance, relevance and community'.[1]

Before we discuss about feeling and form we would like to present the problem as primary quest, along with allied elemental aspects of the two in the context of the nature of Indian aesthetics.

Ṛgvedic view of aesthetics is the result of direct perception of Nature But the common analogy in this relationship has been taken from the facts of art, which is usefulalso, suchasa *ratha.* Therefore, suchevidences add more emphasis on technical skill, form (rūpa) and utility. The thought process of Ṛgvedic artists are not known and can be inferred only through analogies. Feeling is expressed in terms of *manas* or *dhīḥ.* 'Inspired poets were to see through heart and mind' (Hṛdā paśyanti manasā. Rv. X. 177. 1.) In one of the verses of 'Ṛgveda' a poet says 'I embelish my songs as a deft handed (expert artisan with mental inspiration) (Apo na dhīro manasā suhastayo girah samañje Rv. 1. 64. 1.) This shows (on the analogy of a poet as well as a *rathakāra* (according to Sāyaṇa) an artistic creation needs (1) expediency of work (Kauśala, dakṣatā, dhīratā etc.); in relation to plastic art deft handedness (suhastyaḥ), (2) meantal vision, imagination and feeling (manas) or insight. For a vedic seer to see a thing through mind was as good as to see with eyes. (Pasyan manye manasā chakṣusā tān; Rv. X 136. 6) Emphasis was considered in terms of efficiency (sukṛti) employing on utility rather than on beauty. The reason is not far to seek. Our earlier seers (as in the western theory of aesthetics) there was no difference between art and craft. A vedic poet says 'as a skilled craftman fashions out a car, this hymn for you, O mighty One, I, a reciter have made' (Rv. V. 2. 11).

Two words, however occur for lovely or beautiful. One *chārutva* (.beautifulness) and the other *vāma* (lovingly, used to describe the physical beauty or beauty of thought (Rv. X. 70.9. V. 82.6, VIII. 22. 18, VIII 103. 5). No object of art is associated with these words.

One very significant statement has been made in relation to feeling and its reactions. We have referred to above the third property of feeling is community—the community of connoisseurs. In the 'Ṛgveda' they are described as *sakhā*. The very word anticipates the intimate relationship between one who feels and one or more to whom the feeling is expressed. While the perception and feeling in the poet is the same, the reception by the connoisseurs (sakhāyaḥ) is not the same. The connoisseurs react differently, may be even detached, as the Ṛgvedic example explains. Why so happens? The Vedic seer Bṛhaspati says 'fellows (sakhāyaḥ) endowed alike with eyes and ears have become unequal in the swift—movings of the mind (manojaveṣu), (akṣaṇvantaḥ karṇvantaḥ sakhāyo, manojaveṣu asamā babhūvaḥ; Rv. X. 71. 7). The differecia of emotional level and attitude is nicely indicated here.

Certain significant postulates emerge in post Ṛgvedic thoughts, not only in relation to feeling. But also in relation to different phases of creation of art. Such word as *rūpa, pratirūpa* for form, *kāma* for intention and feeling, *dhīḥ* (mind) for vision of artist, *dhyāna* for contemplation and comprehension, *mātrā* for measurment of matter of substance etc. come to our knowledge, One significant anticipation is expressed in the 'Aitareya Brāhmaṇa' which states that 'the complete fact of existence is life which indeed is the potentiality of a living body. This living body of man is the receptable of all kinds of feelings and experiences—actual or imaginative. This humanistic approach to the feeling paves the way for considerations of Vedic postulates on the worldly (laukika) plane. Hence, an attempt is valid to understand the above mentioned postulates of aesthetics on the humanistic plane.

First we would consider the doctrine of *pratirūpa*. The speculations in the post-vedic literature provide no positive aesthetic theory but on the analogies of philosophic speculations something significant about aesthetics we can note. The *pratirūpa* is understood as the ultimate principle, the whole, one form, without fragments, total of all multiples etc. As against this *rūpa* is one form, or the reflection of *pratirūpa* created or made form (Śilpa), a part of *pratirūpa* (kalā). A *pratirūpa* can be manifested into many forms (rūpāṇi)[2]. The well known maxim 'rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratirūpobabhūva' (Rv. VI. 47. 18) is very significant in this context. In the whole verse it is indicated that one single creative process operative in his diversified demonstrations of manifesting multiplicity for form and by one single divine essence as the god-creator (called Indra in Rv. 6. 47. 11), who uses or has made his ownself, own form, own body the model for the purpose (tadasya rūpam, svam tanvam; Rv. 3. 63. 8)[3].

In other context *pratirūpa* is exclaimed on the worldly plane. 'Son is born as his *pratirūpa*' (asya putraḥ pratirūpajayate; Taitt. Brāhmaṇa. 3. 9. 22. 2). Elesewhere it is said that offspring is virtually the resemblance (anurūpa). Therefore they (the artist) render the *pratirūpa* into *anurūpa* (likeness).[4]

The duality of *pratirūpa* and *rūpa* has been variously mentioned in the vedic literature. Five such dual phrases are collected here as follows :—[5]

1. *Sarvarūpa-pratirūpa—Anurūpa*
2. *Mānasī pratirūpa —Chākṣusī-pratirūpa*
3. *Amūrta —Mūrta*
4. *Devaśilpa —Mānuṣīśilpa*
5. *Pratirūpa* as *Śilpa*—*Śilpa* as *Pratirūpa*

If such phrases are re-arranged the meaning and process of the transformation of *pratirūpa* to *rūpa* would be clear.

According to the Upanişadic concept *sarvarūpa* or *prātirūpa* is 'Brāhman'. In the original state it is *amūrta* which through a mental process manifests as *mānasīpratirūpa*. This also be called *pratirūpaśilpa*. The *chakşuşīpratirūpa* is the visible form or *amūrta*, *mūrta or mānuşīśilpa* or *Śilpa* as *pratirūpa*. The phrase *mānasīpratirūpā cha chākşuşī* may significantly be translated as the transformation of the mental or *dyāna* image into visual image or *mūrta* form, which is *mānuşīśilpa* or '*Śilpa* as *pratirūpa*.[6] To avoid the confusion, however, *rūpa* would be a convenient for calculated form for our further discussion.

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa' it is stated that *rūpa* cannot emerge out of nothing. It emerges out of matter. In other words, as Niharranjan Ray observes, that form (rūpa) actually lies hidden or potential in matter. This kind of form which is emerged out of matter is perceptible. But further it is explained that pure matter is entirely devoid of form (analogous to amūrta, pratirūpa). But in its ultimate stage it is so united with form that its seperate manifestation is no more possible. There is progressive realisation of matter in form through mental and action process. In the 'Chhāndogya Upanişad' it is objected how something can come out of nothing ? But the solution is given in the consideration that the matter also is present in the form of Brāhman or devatā, and all matters are impregnated with form, idea etc. The *Kāma* in the primodial matter has many *rūpa* which manifests when desired (bahu bhāvitum ichchhā).[7] The will to be many (rūpāṇi) is inherent in all things. This view is present in latter thoughts also, even in the Buddhistic concept the Ādi Buddha' is void yet, considered as the embodiment of the five *skandhas–Rūpa* (form), *Vedanā* (sensation), *Saṁjñā* (name), *Saṁskāra* (confirmation) and *vijñāna* (consciousness), which when desired manifest into five 'Dhyanī Buddhas', who ultimately are the sources of all divine forms in the Buddhist iconology. On the same principle the *Chaturviṁśati* Vişṇus have evolved out of *parā Vişṇu.*[8]

B. M. Barua finds the root of entire 'Aitareya' thinking in the 'Nāradīya Śūkta, in which it is said that in the background of the whole process of creation is the 'Primeval Matter' pulsating with its own life, vibrating with its inherent force. *Tāpasa* or creative fervour is the Primeval Matter; gives rise to *Kāma* (the creative will), the will to be transformed into mental action (manaso retaḥ), the imaginative factor from which the entire series of creation on forms follows in visible or tangible shapes.[9]

Barua has indicated on the basis of a late text 'Gayā Mahātmya' three states in the passage of figuration of form (1) *avyakta* or potential; (2) *vyaktāvakta* or semi-actual or mere suggestive and (3) *vyakta* or expressed. But this very idea is deeply rooted in the Sāṅkhya philosophy, which shows the possibililty of expression through the four stages—*sūkṣma, paśyantī, madḥyāmā* and *vaikharī*. The *sūkṣma* or *parā* (subtle) manifestation is luminous and eternal. *Paśyantī* is also luminous, but self conscious. The next manifestation is *madhyamā*, which is conceptual and not in form. The final manifestation is *vaikharī*, which is in the full form. These postulates have been fully analyised in the poetics as well as in the Indian musicology.

The situation of *arūpa* and *rūpa* is made clear in the 'Vastusūtra Upaniṣad.'[10] In one Sūtra (V. 21) it is stated that 'from the formless arises form' (arūpad—rūpaṁ tasya phalaṁ). This idea finds its origin in the Atharve dic idea which mentions 'each several form, each several force I seize and compass round this man (rupaṁ rupaṁ vayovaḥ etc. A. V. XIX. 3) According to the concept of 'Pippalāda Saṁhitā,' women are worshippers of image (pratirūpa), for them the Secondary images are created. 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (III. 2. 1. 5.) gives a different inference. According to this form—a reflected image in art is *rūpa* which is for worship. Later theorists describe the outcome of *rupa* as reflected bliss (pratibimbānanda). *Pratirūpa* is the secondary divinity, for decoration. But on theoretical plane this type of distinction is not logical. Reflected image and Secodary image are the artistic results of the same creative process. But while explaining the scope of the study of *Śilpa*, it is said that His form (rūpa) is reflected into *pratirūpa* and the knowledge of that *rūpa* (or pratirūpa) is *rūpavidyā tachchhilpasūtramiti* (V.21).

A. K. Coomarawami contemplating of the problem of *rūpa* explains[11] that the vision of beauty is an act of pure contemplation, not in the absence of any object of contemplation but is conscious identification with the object of contemplation. Just as the concept of the artist is most perfectly realized in the person of the 'Divine Architect, so the concept of the spectator is most perfectly realized in the 'Self, one 'Person, single Self, who at one and the same time and for ever sees all things (Viśvaṁ abhichaste) seeing without duality (dṛṣṭādvaita) verily seeing though he does not look (paśyanvai tannapaśyati), and whose intrinsic aspect (*svarūpa*) is the single image of all things (Visvarūpa; rūpaṁ rūpaṁ pratirūpm). This is the perfection of aesthetic contemplation who as very self surveys the variegated world—picture as nothing other than the self-depicted on the mightly canvas of the self, and takes a great delight therein—that is, the consumation, equally of art and understanding. That is the pure being of the self, in the identity of its essence and its nature, within you, where there are neither works to be done nor thought to be communicated, but a simple and delighted understandings one perfection, though reflected brokenly in all things perfect in their kind, one image—bearing light, though reflacted in all things well and truely made.

This speculative position is very well commented by Niharranjan Ray who has traced the process of tranformation as follows :—[12]

The sculptur has the germ of an idea in his mind, an image in his vision, and he feels an inner urge to give a shape and from since it is yet like a breath *avyakta* informed (paśyantī).

He therefore looks out for his material, of his choice being conditioned by nature and character of the germ of the idea or vision that already he has (mādhyamā ?).

The moment the sculptor comes into contact with the material, the latter begins to communicate with him, and at the early stages of this process of mutual communication, the sculptor comes to perceive and know whether the piece or surface chosen is capable of becoming the conceived form. So long the idea or vision is not fully realised or concretized is form, that is fully *vyakta* the process of mutual communication remains ever alive and the duality of form and matter is resolved in the mind and action (vyaktāvyakta ?).

When the artists vision or image has been fully made manifest is formal concretization, it became object of art, with intrinsic perception (vyakta form vaikharī).

Considering in terms of subject and object the duality continues for some time and merges into one whole through certain mental and physical changes. Subject is artist and object is idea realized and expressed is the material form i. e. the art—object. The changes are subject to various psychic of psycho-physical transformation (bhāva) and also due to the ability of articulation of matter into form, that is art-object. We have not bothered here about the hypothetical stages of creative process as often the theorists of Indian aesthetics want. But we may choose one popular example of ancient Indian thought which is very practical. The example is of a potter, who wills to create a pot (ahaṁ ghaṭaṁ karomi). This famous aphorism of Nyāya and Sāṅkya is very useful. In the context of artistic creation it can be interpreted as follows :—

Ahaṁ denotes the artist (Kartā) who is determined with 'will to create'. He has the knowledge of what he has to make, i.e the *ghaṭaṁ* the *Saṁjñā*. The *Saṁjñā* itself is determinative feature of *ghaṭaṁ*. The artist when determined to create, it is applied that he in his mind (chitta) had full concept of the form (ākara-rūpa) of *ghaṭa*. The word *Karomi* (I am doing) is indicative of the fact that he has sufficinat technical skill to execute his knowledge of form, through a material medium in the form of *ghaṭa*, which can easily be recognized as *ghaṭa* (Saṁjñā).

This example indicates all the elemental process of creation–*ichchhā* (to create a ghaṭa) *jñāna* (the knowledge of form of ghaṭa) *Kriyā* (actual creation).

The 'Vāstu Sūtra Upaniṣad,' which deals sculpture, gives much emphasis on 'form'. The text is a profound study of fundamental principles of origin and ultimate purpose of form. Refering to esoteric doctrine, the production of '*Śilpa*' is considered as a sacrificial act and based on philosophical and metaphysical conceptions. It is related with the vedic idea of language of form, equal to spoken words, giving vision to divine truth and touching the deepest mysteries of Existence.

Alice Boner considers the text as 'profounded professional secret and thus the highest degree of intuition. It was accessible only to masters, who had acquired it through a life-long practice and single mind devotion'. She further adds that the essential concern of form is not to demonstrate the form for a simple delight of the senses and for extolling the beauties of world, it has a far deeper significance. It considered an autonomus, direct reflection of religious and metaphysical conceptions. When the art–forms take their being from fundamental cosmic principle, they participate in the essential structure of Universe and contain a natural symbolism to which unsophisticated human beings respond instinctively, unconsciously. It is impossible to escape these elemental cosmic contingencies.[13]

The role of *chitta saṁjñā* (mental activity) in relation to artistic manifestation has been explained by A. K. Coomarswami by[14] giving particular stress to the significance of *dhyāna* and *sādhanā*. Thus, it is explained that the mind (chitta) itself is attracted (ākṛṣṭa) towards, the form (primary form). It is also described in the Upaniṣadic terminology as *jñāna satva-rūpa*–the true or pure knowledge of form. This form is inwardly conceived (antara jñeya) and received as reflection (pratibimbavat) in the mind or *chitta*. There is complete identification between the primary form and the secondary form and thus this serves the purpose of a model. Clarity of vision in receiving as well as in reflecting the form is essential. As the moon reflects in the wâter so the *rūpa* is reflected in the *chitta* or *chittra*. This also indicates the identity of form (*rūpa*) and idea (chitta—visaya or bhāva).

'Paśyantibhāva rūpaiścha
Jale chandramasmyathā
Tadvachchittramayīm saraṁ
paśyanti Brahmavādinaṁ'

This mirror like reflection of mind in object of art also endorsed by Buddhaghoṣa (5th century A. D.) by stating that whatever is objectively projected in art is nothingless but the spontaneous activity of the mind. The 'Aṭṭhasālinī' (p. 64) says that the objective expression is only an acceptable translation of it (chitta).

A. K. Coomarswami attributes much significance to *dhyāna* or personal devotion in the creation of object. According to him 'in any case; the principle involved is that true knowledge of an object is not obtained by merely emperical observation or reflex registration (pratyakṣa), but only when the knower and know, seer and seen meet in act transcending distinction. Whatever object may be the artist chosen or appointed theme becomes for the time being the single object of his attention and devotion.,[15]

A. K. Coomarswami has demonstrated the significance of the duality of *parokṣa* and *pratyakṣa* in relation to object in mind. Though used in contrasted sense and made distinct on the basis of various Vedic and Upaniṣadic passages as *adhidaivata* and *adhyātma* or *mānuṣa*.

Thus *daivata* or *adhidaivata* is a *parokṣa* which reflects in the *mānuṣī bimba* as *pratyakṣa*. It is also an individualistic experience. Therefore reference of the *parokṣa* is much wider than of *pratyakṣa* as terms. Justification of this kind of duality of *parokṣa* and *pratyakṣa* in worldly creation, particularly in art, is explained that since that the lotus of iconography is not the sensible experience, it is *parokṣa* (not recognizable to those who do not understand art and most of the accidents proper to the lotus of the botanist are ommitted. Therefore the lotus of iconography is *adhidaivata,* that of the lotus of the botanist is sensible *pratyakṣa.*[16]

This kind of distinction between direct and indirect can be made only on the basis supra-mental perception. In *vyavahāra* (loka) the lotus of nature is certainly a botanical truth, and *pratyakṣa,* but in artistic sensibility it is the lotus, the mental image is significant. This may be perceptionally *parokṣa* but when presented through a medium it becomes *pratyakṣa.* Hence the distinction between *pratyakṣa* and *parokṣa* may mean world of things in metaphysics, it art-creation both are identical through the perceptibility and media of mind and matter. After a lengthy philosophical exercise on passage after passage of the 'Vedas' and 'Upaniṣadas' Coomarswami concludes that *parokṣa* and *pratyakṣa,* both are *daivata*–One Supreme *devadevānam* (pārokaṣa) and the individual soul as *devatā* (pratyakṣa). This kind of spiritual realization makes it clear that 'the *parokṣa* and *pratyakṣa* under-standing are not divided by an impossible wall; it is unified and mere understanding' with reference to degrees (ekībhūtaḥ·prajñāna·ghana). Thus identification of distinction is according to 'Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad' is due to the suprasensual experience of delight or modality of Ecstacy.[16]

Ananda Commarswami has revealed a sort of parallelism in an artist and a *yogin.* There is no doubt that various elements of *yoga* had direct bearing on the Indian aesthetics by way of suggesting form as well as idea. But more emphasis is suggested by Coomarswami in the form of mental process before creation. Elsewhere, as we have noted, he has discussed elaborately the Yogic elements related to *dhyāna, chitta, ābhāsa* etc. influencing the mental process in the artist.

He first defines *yoga* as mental concentration, carried so far as the overlooking of all distinction between the subject and the object of contemplation[17] In the commentary of 'Brahma Sūtra' (3. 2. 10) by Saṁkarāchārya it is said that the arrow-maker, when works, perceives nothing beyond his work. He quotes 'Śukranīti' :—

'Let the imager' establish images in temples by meditation on the deity. For the successful achievement of this *yoga* the lineaments of the image to be dwelt upon in detail. In no other way (other than dhyāna) not even by direct and immediate vision of an actual object, it is possible to be so absorbed in contemplation, as thus in the making of images'. In 'Agni Purāṇa' (Ch. XLIII) the realization of a form through *dhyāna* is considered in terms of dream. In dream the contracted reflection in the mind creates a vision (ābhāsa) of the object of creation. The practice of visualization is considered identical to worship. The worshipper recites the *dhyāna mantras,* describing the deity and forms a corresponding mental picture. The artist follows identical process, but proceeds to represent the mental picture in a visible and objective form. The Buddhist postulates describe the process of *dhyāna* and concentration in more elaborate way. According to such sources the artist like *yogins* and *sādhakas* has to perform sevenfold rites—from invocation of Buddha and Bodhisattvas to contemplation upon the *Śūnyatā.* This elaborated process, shows a clear understanding of the psychology of imagination; transformation of imagination (or thinking principle) to self (identification, with the object of work and the vividness of the final image.[18]

Coomarswami on the basis of several examples suggests that *yoga* (union) is not merely a mental exercise or a religious discipline, but the most practical preparation for any undertaking whatever. But for the artist *yoga* is rather a means than the end. Through *dhyāna*—a *yogic* process, not only the form is realised but personal relation between the subject and the object is also established. As a ritual, *dhyāna* before creation or preperation for creation is superistition. It would be really a rare combination to find a *yogī* in a *śilpī* in one person and both on one level. In the ultimate analysis the concentration on the reflection of an image qualitatively differ with the *yogic* meditation in which the union of subject and the object is realised as a pre-determined process. In the Indian concept of creative process of art the theme or the object is largely pre-determined not only as the mental reflection, but also as the physical fact of iconography and beauty.

The claim of aestheticians that the bliss of art is of the same genius as the bliss (ānanda) of the soul (as conceived in the metaphysics) is not identical. It is creative, of the essence of joy, self-dependent and so intense as to shut out all other intruding lower pleasure and pain. In the words of Mammaṭa it is like the bliss of the soul (Vigalita vedyāntaraṁ ānandaṁ).

Saṁkarāchāryain his *bāṣya* on the 'Taittirīya Upaniṣad', traces the source of bliss in the enjoyment of *rasa* (rasonām triptiheturānandakaro). But it happens only when the *rasa* of the physical realm is carried to super-physical realm in the form of aesthetic realisation. The transformation of this aesthetic realisation, according to metaphysical principles, is through different sheaths of life. Man has a physical sheath (the sthūla śarīra) a sheath of energy, a sheath of agitated mentality and sheath of calm and stead fast mentality (the sūkṣma śarīra) and a sheath of bliss or *ānanda* (the karma śarīra). Again the *pañcha kośa* theory is described also as the *annamaya kośa* (body), *prāṇamaya kośa* (enengy), *manomaya kośa* (mind), *vijñānamaya-kośa* (intelect) and the *ānandamaya kośa* (bliss). *Sthūla śarīra* is body, *śuksma śarira* comprises energy, mind and intelect and the *karma śarira* comprises the radiant and tenuous and translucent sheaths (āvaraṇa), which refers to beauty and bliss.[19] In aesthetic experience the lower sheaths of life do not provide full satisfaction but for full satisfaction they provide the path which ultimately leads to full satisfaction or (parmānanda) or pure bliss (kevala ānanda). To reach this high level of attainment, the theory of *pañcha kośas* suggest—that we grow higher and higher till we reach the *ānandamaya kośa,* starting from *annamaya kośa.* In other words the theory of satisfaction pre-supposes the full-filment of all desires, at all levels —physical, mental, intellectual and finally spiritual. This attainment is analogous in process of aesthetic satisfaction. By the aid of clear vision and imagination and intention we realise the innermost truth of things and beauty of creation.

This concept quite naturally, adds the ethical and moral values to the aesthetic enjoyment of bliss, which is the result of elevation of qualities. In Indian metaphysics *triguṇa* concept prevails everywhere in the Nature and the Mind. Of the *tamas* (inertia) and *rajas* (activity) the *sattavaguṇa* (equipoise) is supreme and produces the ability in mind to receive the bliss, which is also the result of *rasa-siddhi* (Raso vai saḥ rasaena heyvāyaṁ labdhānandi bhavati). Madhusūdana Saraśvatī considers that *sattva guṇa* alone is capable of receiving image in the mind (chitta) (Chidibiṁbagrahaṇayogyatvāt). In metaphysical concept as well as in art *sattva* predominates and the reception of image or divine consciousness depends upon clarity of mind. In the 'Aparājitapṛcchā' the relationship of mind and image is explained with the phrase *jalechandramasaṁ.* The clarity of water (jala) receives the image relatively in pure form.[20]

The inter-relationship of aesthetic bliss and spiritual bliss has been shown by several aestheticians. The primary factor is the pure mind full of *sattva.* Viśvanātha in his 'Sāhityadarpaṇa' says that *rasa* which by reason of the predominance of *sattva guṇa* (sattvoddreka) is full of limitless and spontaneous and self luminous consciousness (prakāśānandachinmayaḥ) and bliss, which is free from the taint of intruding objects (vedyāntara sparśa śūnyaḥ) which is akin to Absolute bliss (Brahmānandasahodaraḥ), whose life is supreme and superworldly and exquisite charm (lokottarachamatkāra-prāṇaḥ) is enjoyed in a state of union of enjoyer and enjoyed by fortunate and happy discerners of delight.

Here a distinction also is suggested between the aesthetic bliss and the spiritual bliss. The former is not *Brahmānanda,* but *Brahmānandasahodara* (akin to Brahmānanda). As a matter of fact, the aesthetic bliss is a kind of reflected bliss (pratibiṁbānanda)--either the reflecction of one's own (as Dhanañjaya says in 'Daśarūpaka' (IV. 43). He calls the aesthetic bliss as *ātmānandasamudbhava.* Jagannātha in his 'Rasagaṅgādhara' designates this similarly as *nijasvarūpānanda.* On the contrary, spiritual bliss unqualified and absolute, is not reflection but the identification of mind and image; union of *chitta* and *ānanda* (Chidānanda). This bliss is not to be achieved through senses. It is extream and beyond the senses as indicated in 'Gītā' (Sūkhamātyāntikaṁ Yattadbuddhigrāhyamatīndriyam; Ch. VI Verse 21). In metaphysics *rasa* itself is Brahman and the source of bliss (ānandakāraṇam Rasa-Brahma).

For comparison, we may consider certain metaphysical concepts of the West. The *pratibimbavāda* of the Indian theorists, finds reference in the Platonic concept, who defines art to be a shadow of shadow 'a reflection of reflection.' He also assorted that ideas are transcedental and seperate from matter. This has relevancy to the Indian concept of *bhāva* (idea) and *padārtha*(matter). Aristotle's concept regarding the unism of idea and matter is nearer to Indian concept. Thus he has said that our world of experience is not a mere shadow of the ideal world. It is not mearely a world of appearances. Art represents a real world of form and matter in union. He, as well as Plato belived that soul (human) is the part of God and the soul receives the Divine reflection as it is reflected in art. As some of the Indian theorists considered the aesthetic experience as unworldly (alaukika), Plotinus also considered it as 'akin to mystic experience'. His theory of triad principle or triplicate division of man into (1) Spirit, (2) Soul and (3) Body is much common with the *kośa* concept of Indian metaphysics. According to him these three division of man is related with the three levels of human experience. Levels of experience has been differently explained by Leibniz on the plane of aesthetics and metaphysics. He has suggested that from the lower sensuary experience one passes through emotive and intellectual to higher i.e., spiritual. This kind of successive experiences are necessary for the creation for a good piece of art.

As opposed to the aesthetic school of intellectualists, the transcendental concept of aesthetics of Kant is more relevant for comparision. Being a transcendentalist, he proposed that transcendental self is a condition which proceeds all experiences. Thus, his transcendental self is akin to Indian *ātmavāda*. That aesthetic experience is disinterested and free from individuality in its subjective aspect and from the relation to matter in its objective aspect is also nearer to the concept of 'self' of the 'Upaniṣadas' and his theory of disindividualisation in artistic experience and other literary process is akin to the similar theories of Bhaṭṭanāyaka. His theory that soul of work of art (Kāvyasyātmā) is the aesthetic idea which genius alone can supply and that 'the representation of free imagination which gives riseto more thought, though not definite, can be grasped in any definite concept is nearerto certain literary and metaphysical concepts of India, particularly to Ānandavardhana, and his concept of *dhvani*.

But the absolutist Hegel has many points of comparision not only from the point of view of metaphysics, but also from the point of view of literary creation.[21]

Art, according to Hegel is the sensuous presentation of 'Absolute'. It is the first of the highest triad, manifested by the Absolute—(1) art, (2) religion and (3) philosophy. It is the thesis which is synthetized with religion, the antithesis, in philosophy. Thus, art belongs to the sphere of Absolute mind. Further, imaginatson is the phase of representation. The other two factors of the triad of theoretical mind are intuition (as the first factor and thinking as the last factor), representation is the second phase of mental manifestation. Actual performation is the function of practical mind.[22]

A comperative study of the metaphyscial concept of aesthetics of Hegel and Abhinavagupta has been presented by K. C. Pandey. The salient points of this comparision are given below with some modification :—both Hegel and Abhinavagupta agree that the highest function of art is to present the 'Divine,' through its mode or forms. Both are concerned with the explanation of the entire range of experience from the highest to the lowest. They hold the entire fold of experience—including the subject, the object, the means of knowledge and knowledge itself or the ideas, the objective natural things and the individual mind (as Hegel calls it)-to be explicable in terms of a single ultimate principle. Hegel calls the principle 'Absolute' and Abhinavagupta describe as 'lokottara' or 'anuttara' (unworldly). In the Hegelian concept it is further developed that a work of art occupies a midway ground with the directly perceived objective world on the one hand and the ideality of pure thought on the other. This idea of a work of art is nearer to the concept of aesthetic experience which is 'alaukika'. Hegel is of the opinion that a work of art points to something beyond itself (transcendental). This concept is nearer to the concept of *dhvani.*[23]

The Upaniṣadic idea expression 'raso vai saḥ' may by considered reflecting in the thought of Hegel exposing universal or rational principle, which refers that spirit is free and independent. It does not lie in abstract universality, but as concretised by its self-expression or self-manifestation in its actions and emotions in the midst of external natural environment. K. C. Pandey is of the opinion that the very priniciple of Hegel about 'recognization of Absolute' is similar to the basic doctrine of *pratyabhijñā* or *Īśvarapratyabhijña* of Kashmiri Śaivism.[24]

Schopenhauer has described the transcendental nature of aesthetics and has held that aesthetic experience is the experience of idea—the immedicate manifestation of 'will' free from all relations. It is obtained when knowledge is free from 'will' and the subject is unrelated with the element of individuality. It is therefore transcendental. He holds that this kind of transcendental knowledge is got intuitively by a connoisseur, contemplating on a beautiful work of art. His concept of transcendentality is not much away from Indian metaphysical concept of *sādhaka* (artist) who has achieved a stage which is 'bhāvātīta' through meditation (dhyānayoga). He, explaing that if the object is free from all relations to what is not itself, to what is outside itself, and if the subject is free from all relations to 'will', then that which is so known is no longer the particular thing as such, but it is the idea, the eternal form, the immediate objectivity of the 'will'. The aesthetic experience is nothing else than the disinterested apprehension of the relationless object, by self forgetful and will-less subject who has transcended his personality. In this state of affair the subject which passes into the object; that is free from all relations, becomes one with the object: for the whole consciousness is nothing, but perfectly distinct of the object. Subject and objict are one–they interpenetrate each other complety.

The Unity of subject and the object through contemplation has been a faccination topic of discussion in Indian poetics and philosophy under the concept of *tadākāratā, tadrūpaṁ, svarūparūpaṁ, pratirūpaṁ* etc.

The intuitive theorist Croce is important from the point of view of laying the foundation comperative aesthetics. In his opinion in aesthetic experience the connoisseur becomes spiritually identical with the artist. Unless the connoisseur have risen to the level of the artist spiritually, he cannot reproduce artistic vision in himself. This idea finds a parallel in Indian thought as exprssed by Bhaṭṭa Tauta who has admitted the identity of the experiences of the connoisseur with that of artist. (nāyakasya kaveḥ srotuḥ samāno anubhavastataḥ).

References

1. Bernard Bosanquet, *The Concept of Aesthetics*, p. 2.
2. P. K. Agrwala, *Aesthetic Principles Indian Art*, pp. 25-26.
3. Ibid., p. 26.
4. Ibid., p. 29.
5. Ibid., p.45.
6. See for detail, Ibid., p. 45–50.
7. *An Approach to Indian Art*, p. 54.
8. See my paper 'Viṣṇu: Chaturvimśatimūrtaḥ' [in the proceeding of Seminar on Viṣṇu, M. S. University, Baroda, 1983.
9. Ancient Indian Theories of Art 'in *J. I. S. O. A.* Vol. I, pp. 81.84.
10. Alice Boner, *Vāstu Sūtra Upaniṣad*, pp. 3–6.
11. Coomarswami, *Collected papers*, Pt. I, pp. 93–94.
12. *An Approach to Indian Art*, pp. 57–59.
13. *Vāstu Sūtra Upniṣad*, pp. 3, 4, 6.
14. A. K. Coomarswami, *Transformation of Nature in Art*, pp. 6–7.
15. Ibid., pp. 124–125, 137.
16. Ibid., p. 121, 132.
17. A. K. Coomarswami. *Dance of Śiva*, p. 26.
18. Ibid., p. 28,
19. *Indian Aesthetics*, pp. 6–7.
20. V. S. Pathak, in Rajbali Pandeya smṛtigrantha, p. 334.
21. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II. pp. 292–293.
22. Ibid., p. 362.
23. Ibid., pp. 357–360.
24. Ibid., p. 358.
25. Ibid., pp. 478–479.

References

1. Prof. [illegible]
2. P. [illegible], Indian [illegible], pp. [illegible]
3. [illegible]
4. [illegible]
5. [illegible]
6. [illegible] Ibid., p. 37–40
7. [illegible] p. 34.
8. [illegible] paper '[illegible]' in the proceeding of seminar on [illegible], M. S. University, Baroda, 1965.
9. A short Intro. [illegible] Vol I pp. 51 54.
10. Alice Boner, [illegible] pp. [illegible]
11. Coomaraswamy, [illegible] papers, Pt. I, pp. 79–94
12. [illegible] pp. 77–[illegible]
13. [illegible] pp. [illegible]
14. A. K. Coomaraswamy, Transformation of Nature in Art, pp. 5–7.
15. Ibid., pp. 124–125, 137.
16. Ibid., pp. 110, 112.
17. A. K. Coomaraswamy, Dance of Siva, p. 26.
18. Ibid., p. 23.
19. Indian Aesthetics, pp. 5–7.
20. P. S. [illegible] p. 234.
21. Coomaraswamy, [illegible], Vol. II, pp. [illegible]
22. Ibid., p. 262.
23. Ibid., pp. 259–260.
24. Ibid., p. [illegible]
25. Ibid., pp. [illegible]

IV

Nature of Aesthetics in Non Canonical Literature

Some of the identical problems of art and aesthetics have been considered by the aestheticians, *Sāhitya-śāstrīs* and metaphysicians since the time of the 'Vedas'. We have studied them in earlier chapters. Besides we have a number of aestheticians known as *Śilpavidās* or *Vāstuśāstra-updeṣṭās*, who have thought out the problems of aesthetics in their respective works. By their nature, they were impersonal in their writings and they popularised their writings and devoted studies in the names of divines, *ṛṣis*, *āchāryas* etc. The aesthetics of *Śilpa* was so significant in ancient times that it was given the status of 'Upaveda.' The history of 'Śilpa' dealing with aesthetical problems begin, with the 'Śulva sūtra' which deal to some extent the formal qualities of architecture. The term *vāstu* is all comprehensive from the point of view of its development and practical comprehensions. Our ancients fundamentally belived in the essential unity of all arts and all devoted to a single goal and forming a single entity. The *vāstu*, was to be embelished with sculpture and painting. Other two fine arts, dance and music also had their specific visual role in the *vāstu* entities.

The list of a number of such aesthetic *vāstuśāstra-updeṣṭā* or *āchāryas* are fortunately known to us, though the bulk of their works have gone with the time. The earlier list in the 'Bṛhat-Saṁhitā' (ch. 57) includes seven names—Garga, Maya, Viśvakarman, Vasiṣṭha, Nagnajita, Bhāskara and Manu. The 'Matsya Purāṇa' gives the list of eighteen *Vāstuśāstra-updeṣṭā* including the names of various *ṛṣis* and *devatās*. Only three names of this list Viśvakarman, Maya and Nagnajita are known with their works. 'Agni Purāṇa' exceeds this to twenty-five and 'Mānasāra' to thirty-two. In the 'Viśvakarma-Prakāśa, it is said that Garga was first *āchārya*, from whom it was learnt by Parāśara. From Parāśara it was available to Bṛhadratha and from him it was received by Viśvakarman. It was Viśvakarmā who propagated the *śāstra* to others for the benifit of the world (Viśvakarmā jagato hitāyakathayatpunaḥ). Among the Buddhist traditions, as recorded in the 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Nagnajita the art of painting was propounded by Viśvakarmā, then Prahalāda and then Nagnajita. Viśvakarman was so famous as an *āchārya* that several works such as 'Viśvakarmaprakāśa, 'Viśvakarmamata'. 'Viśvakarmaśāstra, Viśvakarma Śilpa,' 'Viśvakarma Vāstuśāstra' etc. became current. Works known (mostly not available) by the names of *ṛṣis* are 'Kaśyapa Śilpa', 'Nārada Saṁhitā' 'Nārada Śilpa',' Chitralakṣaṇa' of Nagnajita, 'Vāstuvidhāna' of Piṣuna, 'Vāstuśāstra' of Parāśara 'SanatKumāra vāstu' 'Siddhārthapṛcchā', 'Siddhārth-Saṁhitā.' It is to be understood that the works known in the names of ancient *ṛṣis* are not very ancient. The bulk of material related to *śilpa* and aesthtics in the 'Purāṇas' are also ascribed to ancient *ṛṣis* and *devatās*. Thus, the relevent chapters of 'Matsya', 'Agni' and 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇas' are ascribed to Matsya. Hayagrīva and Mārkaṇḍeya respectively. Mārkaṇḍeya is the propounder of *Chitralakṣana* as well as considered the author of 'Vāstusūtra'. Probably there were two *śāstric* traditions of ancient art and aesthetics one is led by Viśvakarman and the other by Maya. Associated with Maya the names of works are known as 'Mayadīpikā', 'Mayamatapratiṣṭhā tantra', 'May-amata Śilpa Vidhāna', 'Mayaśāstra,' Maya śilpa', 'Mayasaṁgraha, 'Mayaśilpa-śatakaṁ' etc.

The available texts ascribed to *ṛṣis* or *devatās* do indicate that during the course of the time after the third century A. D. till about 19th centuries there were attempts to collect the '*śilpa*, material scattered among the professional artists. After canonising, they were circulated as if they were the instructions of the ancient sages and of the divine beings. Thus the names of such authors are mere a kind of floating traditions. Hence it is not matter if any doubt if some ancient sages etc. are quoted in some late texts. But it is plausable that the traditional material of '*śilpa* were gradually being or crystalised into two main traditions—one Viśvakarman (belonging to the north) and the second of Maya (belonging to the South India). In the southern tradition, after Maya, Bhṛgu (the ascribed author of 'Śilpa Saṁgraha',) and Atri (Atri Saṁhitā), Mārīchi (Vaikhānasāgaṁ) were the great traditional propounders of the southern tradition of the '*Śilpa*'. It also appears that some '*Śilpa*' texts belonging originally to the north Indian traditions, such as 'Attri Saṁhitā', the works of Viśvakarman and Parāśara were rewritten in the South in the light of South Indian art and architecture. 'Iśānagnrupaddhati' is also a text belonging to the southern tradition. In the same catagory we may. place the works ascribed to Kaśyapa, such as 'Kaśyapasaṁhitā', 'Kaśyapīya,' 'Vaikhānasīya', 'Kaśyapa Jñāna Kāṇḍa', 'Aṁsumadbheda' etc.[1]

The nature of the above mentioned *śilpa* texts (of course which are available) indicate that all arts were knit into a single unit of *vāstuvidyā,* which not only incorporated the practical aspect of art creation and occassionally discussed the techniques, but also the rituals as well as astronomy or astrology. The rituals and religious rites, which were to be performed on the occassion of building a house and astrological data for calculating best time for house building became a perpectual topic of discussion in the *Śilpa* texts as well as in the 'Purāṇas, *Tāntric* works, *Āgamas*' etc. Sometimes they superseed the technical aspect of art and architecture, as the actual construction and technical matter were exclussively left to the artisans and scholars. But it does not mean altogether that the technical aspect were not dealt in the early works, on the contrary, the *Śilpa,* both in ritualistic aspect as well as in technical, gained the recognizition as *Vidyā,* rather equal to the status of the fifth 'Veda' as we have noted earlier. In later times, *Śilpa* was regularly taught. At Nālandā it was one of the subjects of curriculum. 'Śukranīti', a late work' ennumerated *Śilpa Vidyā* among thirty two *Vidyās.* It defines *Vāstuvidya* as a science dealing with public works such as temples, images of gods, gardens, houses, tanks etc.[2] These items form the part of most of early works dealing with *Śilpa* or *Vāstu.*

The early works indicate that *Vāstu* was essentially related with religion and gods like Vāstupati and Tvastrin were worshipped at the time of construction. Selection of ground for construction and the consideration of *māna* was given special attention. The embelishment of *Vāstu* was not ignored and some importance to sculptural art were also given. The mystic concept of *Vāstu* is demonstrated in the instalation of *Yūpa* and *Vedis.* Such consideration are elaborately dealt in the Saṅkhāyana and Āśvalāyana gṛha *sūtras.*[3] In the former text symbolism connected with architecture are also discussed. In such works the technical aspect of art and architecture are not given proper attention. But the epics provide valuable information about this aspect. In the 'Rāmāyaṇa,' *sthapati, vardhakī, takṣaka* and *sūtradhāra* are referred to suggesting the evolved strature of *Vāstu.* In the epics we get a number of types of

Vāstu such as *prasāda, saudha, vimāna, harmya, sabhā* etc. In constructing such houses or buildings the ground plans followed different patterns such as *padma, svastika, vardhamāna, puṣpaka, nandyāvarta, sarvatobhadra* etc. *Toraṇaphaṭika* is also mentioned. 'Rāmāyaṇa' provides probably first reference of architecture being embelished with sculpture. The *toraṇadvāra* of Rāma's palace was decked with golden statues and Bharata's camp was set with jewelled figures. The palace of Rāvaṇa at Laṅkā has been described as embelished with sculptures of birds, serpents, horses and Gajalakṣmī.[4] We have noted the Buddhistic concept of aesthetics. In this period there was great advance in the technical knowledge of art and architecture. The 'jātakas' and early pali canons refer to such houses as *vihāra, maṇḍapa, prasāda, harmya* and *guha* and their distinctive features. They also refers to *bhūmis, padmaka*—mouldings of pillars, *ottha* and *grivā* of a *śikhara, bhittipada* (basement of wall) etc. Certain terms such as *sūchī, uṣnīśa, ālambana, aṅdaka, alindaka, kaṇikā* etc. also occur in the Pali canons, which were specially related with Buddhist architecture.[5]

Thus, there was a gradual evolution in the technical knowledge of '*Śilpa*'. The Arthaśāstra is more elaborate in referring different *mānās* used in architecture. Besides about the forms of various technical words, such as *kapiśirsa indrakośa hastinakha, tala, kapāṭayoga, sandhi, khaṇḍa, vīja* also illuminate about the development of technical aspect of ancient *Śilpa* and *Vāstu*. Certain terms relating to measurements also occure in the 'Arthaśāstra' such as *viśkambha, āyāma* (width), *ucchrāya* (height) and *asri* (corners). The concept of space and its apportionment is the key-note of the town and fort planning and the 'Arthaśāstra' considers this aspect elaborately and defines the situations of gods and goddesses specificelly. Kauṭilya says[6] 'in the centre of city the apartments of gods, such at Aparājita, Jayanta, Vijayanta, Śiva, Vaiśravaṇa, Āsvina and the abode of goddess Madirā shall be appropriately set up. This shows that some thought was given by our ancients about the divine images in terms of space and direction. The images specified with names in the 'Arthaśāstra' and other earlier works, also denote that the iconography developed its relationship with art and its role was some what deternative and consequantly the artist had to follow some systemetic rules, hence enjoyed less freedom than the poests. *Rūpāṇi* was being visualised in materal medium in terms of definie iconographic terms. Proportion in making images was given due consideration and *māna*, as explained in the 'Arthaśāstra' became a model for future guidance also. Though various secterian cults were present in society, but in aesthetical proportion and in technical considerations, the universal principles were adopted. But with the impact of the Mauryan culture, two streams of aesthetics can easily be visualiyed. One the folk art and the other court-art. The former very sincerely followed the traditional rules, particularly in imagary and the latter definitely was mingled with the foreign elements. The extant examples of the former class indicate that on conceptual plane though god and its divinity was a subject of mental visualization in human form, till about the time of the Mauryas or a little earlier it was hesitatingly accepted that the infinite divine power could be contained within the limited normal frame of human body. The possibility of representing the divinity was conceived under special concept *mahāpramāṇa* (representing the figure in more than the nine or ten *tālas*, characterised by collosal size, massively built body, pronounced emphasis on physical strength etc. Thus a most significant and practical aesthetic problem was done by the pre-kushana artists as evident from the 'Yakṣa' images. The concept of *mahāpramāṇa* was also conceived in terms and proportion of four fold harmony–in relation to material, in relation to natural or conceived form, in relation to organic unity and in relation to organic whole in terms of absolute. In short, in early scholastic aesthetic consideration of harmony was significant. The second factor determining the aesthetic form was the material. A few repousse gold plaques depicting mother goddesses, which though cherished the formal qualities of mother goddess- clay figures of early age, in turn also influenced future aesthetic forms in wood and stone. Material was not of much concern than the traditionally conceived aesthetic forms sharing the common qualities of plastic arts—whether in *terra,* or wood or in metal or in stone. The resistence offered by the material was overcome by the strong tradition of aesthetically determined norms. For the Mauryan and pre-Mauryan art we do not get any text dealing with *tālamāna*[7], except the concept of measurement in terms of different units. The concept of the third dimension in the context of the plastic art, which is a grafted feature of Mauryan art, played a dominant role in creating the aesthetic forms in arts and architecture of the period. Such aesthetic concepts characterised by the full comprehension of the third dimension is monumental in the majestic animal capitals of Aśokan pillars. The real aesthetic significance of the Mauryan figures is in the rhythmic proportions, chaste, elegent and smooth forms, realism in anatomical details, dominating and majestic in appearance. Whatever we may think of the origin (of Mauryan court art), the total aesthetic effect of Mauryan columns has never been surpassed in later Indian art. In the whole realm of independent monumental columns of the world, Mauryan columns occupy a proud position by reason of their free and significant artistic form in space, the rhythmic and balanced proportion of their constituent elements, the unitary and integrated effect of the whole, their chaste and elegent shaft and capital, no less by the conscious, proud and dignified attitude of the crowning components.[8] The *yakṣi* figures rendered under this Mauryan concept, certainly deny the wood carving tradition characterised by flatness, in overall effect theyadhere greatly to naturalism of the Harappan art, rather than Achamenian or Hellenic.[9]

The greatest achievement during the period may be noticed in the determining the close relationship between the form and meaning. Meaning of form is made explicit through symbolism. The Aśokan pillar itself can be explained as the symbol of symbolism, which menely not stands as amonumental attractive form, but explain the ideals of a *chakravartī* in the realm of 'Dhamma' and in the realm of temporal world. The monumental animal figures represent the various events and the aspects of personality of Buddha and the *dharmachakra* magnificently symbolise the Buddha's cosmic preaching of the 'Dharma'. As an additional meaning, the Aśokan pillar capital, particularly Sarnath Capital, represents Aśoka as the earthly *chakravartin*, propogating the *Dhamma*, thus serving the holy *chakravartin*, the Buddha. Since this period, symbol and form go together as twins to play an important role in the development of art and aesthetics of India. Certain gesturological position of hands such as *abhaya mudrā*, helped significantly in explaining the symbolic meaning of the image. Similar contribution may be considered about the concept of *mahāpuruṣa lakṣaṇas*, which enriched the images, not only in terms of embelishment, but also in terms of symbolic explanation of the meaning of the form.

The role of traditional texts during this period is difficult to determine, as the bulk of the original texts are lost and only some ideas of ancient sages dealing with *Vāstuśāstra* are found preserved in the ancient literary traditions. The literary or oral traditions together with accumulated experience of generations of artists must have effected the conceptual aspect of ancient aesthetics.

We do not get any textual reference giving the idea of 'relish,' purely in the aesthetic sense. The examples of art upto Kuṣāṇa period give idea about the utilitarian aspect of art in terms of religious sensebility together with symbolic meaning. But the form had special appeal to senses.

Fragments of earlier of *Vāstusāstra* writers quoted in later works, if collected, give fairly a good idea about the nature of *Vāstu* and *Śilpa* texts, which are now lost. Such fragments found in the two earlier works, 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' and 'Matsya Purāṇa' which mainly deal ceremonials selection of sites and soils, collection of wood, division of site and determination of doors etc., astrological consideration of architecture and sculpture, determination of the relationship of architecture with other arts, particularly sculpture and painting, symbolic explanations and mythological back-ground, measurements and calculations etc. A list of such subject matters alongwith the authorities are tabulated by Tarapada Bhattacharya, which is presented here with some modifications :[10]

Subject matter	*Authority*
1. Vāstupuruṣa	—Vṛhaspati
2. Examination of soil and site	—Garga, Nārada, Bhṛgu, Vasiṣṭha
3. Determination of door-position (dvāravidhāna)	—Garga, Nanda, Viśvakarmā, Yama, Bṛhaspati
4. Collection of wood (dārukarma)	— „
5. Vāstupada	—Parāśara (Bharata) Visvakarmā
6. Symbolism	—Garga
7. Sculpture and iconography	—Nagnajit, Maya

8. Different kinds of houses (gṛhavidhāna) —Kiraṇatantra, Viśvakarmā
9. Units of measures —Viśvakarmā
10. Proportions —Viśvakarmā, Garga
11. Material —Garga, Viśvakarmā
12. Mouldings —Garga, Kaśyapa

The above tabulation gives an idea about the comprehensive nature of *Śilpavidyā*. From the fourth century A. D. and onwards the *Śilpavidyā* dealing with the concept of aesthetic as physical fact found its place either in independent treatises or in exclusive chapters of certain monumental works of the age, dealing with astronomy and astrology or a special class of literature i. e. the *Purāṇa*, *Āgama*, *Tantra* and the *nīti*, in which the literary treatment of the subject gained popularity as well as proficiency. Some digests and collections also give importance to the *Śilpavidyā*, particularly iconography. The 'Kṛtyakalpataru' and 'Śritattvanidhi' are the significant works of this class.

The contributions of the 'Purāṇas' to the development of art culture and the technical aspect of aesthetics is to be evaluated first. The significance of 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' lies in the fact that among the earlier texts (mostly to be known in fragments and quotations) it high lights the three aspects of *Vāstuvidyā*. First the *vāstu* in the sense of architecture, the second *tālamāna* (iconometerey) and the third *pratimālakṣaṇa* (iconography). The material which is incorporated in the 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' (ch. 53, 57, 58 etc.) is not the sudden acquisition of 'Varāhamihira' but a summerised form of the oral tradition of *Vāstuvidayā*. The three main streams of the technical aspects of Indian aesthetics dealing with *vāstu* (architecture), *māna* or *tālamāna* (measurement and iconometerey) and *mūrti* or *pratimālakṣaṇa* (iconography or iconology) which were dealt sepeartely and spordiacly were perfectly syncronised in the 'Purāṇic' texts. With exceptions to Buddhist and Jain forms the 'Purāṇas' discussed the forms of gods and goddesses with balanced approach. Their sectarian nature did not effect the canonical treatment. The compilars of the 'Purāṇas' presented the bulk of *Śilpavidyā* in a summerised form. Their approach, however was purely religious, and with religious purpose, they have presented the material relating to art-culture from the practical point of view. Being the works of the North, they quite naturally adhere to the north Indian *Silpa* traditions, represented by Viśvakarman and his followers, though the South Indian traditions ascribed to Maya is not altogether ignored. Both the traditions are perfectly assimilated into one. Architecture and Sculpture are discussed in the 'Purāṇas' not merely as the 'physical' fact in terms of town-planning, fortification, construction of houses, palaces, temples as well as the sculptures in concrete material forms, but also in a comprehensive contexts of astronomy, astrology, universal religious culture, geo-polity etc. The ancient *vāstu* essentially represented by *bhavana* (private, public and royal buildings) and *Prāsāda* (devaprāsāda = temples) were brought closer to *śilpa* (art) represented by sculpture and paintings. This gave practical shape to the concept of the essential unity of all arts—architecture, sculpture and painting. The significance of this process lies in the fact that the socially and religiously relevant *vāstu* depended for its aesthetic embelishment and utility on the art (śilpas) relating to the sculpture and painting.

The very meaning of *devaprāsāda* and *devāyatana* is incomplete without its association with some kind of sculptural art. Therefore, the 'Paurāṇic' scholars took a serious view of the situation and attempted for the canonization of sculptural art, particularly related with the cult-icons. This was not any kind of restriction on the sculptural art, for in matters of ornamentation and decorative embelishment there were full freedom to the artist. Neither these decorative element nor the non-cult icons find any description in the 'Purāṇas'. It appears that the total approach of the *Pauraṇikas* to the art-culture was to preserve and canonise the material of architecture and sculpture with its relevancy to religion. The *Paurāṇic* approach may be described as religiously functional rather than purely aesthetic. Not a single point related with the theoretical aesthetics is discussed in the 'Purāṇas,' except 'Agni,' that too in the context of poetics. The 'Purāṇas' however, give due consideration to the meaning and symbolism of art and explain the mythology behind the icons, some time in detail.

The 'Matsya Purāṇa' sets the model for such studies and the 'Agni Purāṇa' shows the maturity. Both indicate not only the two land-marks and the phases of development but also the two traditions—early and mature.

'Matsya Purāṇa' (ch. 251–252) referring to eighteen teachers of *Vāstu-vidyā* as stated above, indicate the legendry origin of *Vāstu* (puruṣa) from the sweats of Śiva at the time of Andhakavadha (ch. 251–5–15). From the chapters 252 to 257 there is discussion about the time of construction of *prāsāda* and *bhavana*, the types, classification and merits and demerits of the particular type of construction, and of doors, situation of doors and pillars and their types, proportions and measurements, specific considerations of '*śalya*, *sūtra*, *cheda*, *doṣa* etc., and of about wood (dāruāharaṇa) and certain rituals relating to *vāstu*. The chapters 267–269 deal the annual repair (doṣa-upaśamana), classifications and nomenclature of *prāsāda*, the description of the twenty-seven forms of the *maṇḍapas* at their names. Proportions of different structures are also given in the text. The temple-types and their specifications are precisely described in the chapter 268. The 'Matsya Purāṇa' does not mention the term '*Nāgara*' in relation to north Indian temples, but the description very much confirm this very style. But the variations of the *Nāgara* temple styles from the point of views of ground-plan and elevation are mentioned in the texts (ch. 268), which are *Meru*, *Mandara*, *Kailāśa*, *Vimānacchanda*, *Nandivardhana*, *Nandana*, *Sarvatobhadra*, *Vṛṣa*, *Siṁha*, *Gaja*, *Kuṁbha*, *Samudraka*, *Padma*, *Garuḍa*, *Haṁsa*, *Vartula*, *Chaturasra*, *Aṣṭasra*, *Ṣoḍaṣasra*, *Valabhī-cchanda* and *Śrīvṛkṣa*[11] These twenty types of temples, more or less are mentioned in the 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā,' 'Bhavisya Purāṇa' and Viśvakarma Prakāśa' also. They represent the early variations of *Nāgara* temple style. The Garuḍa Purāṇa', 'Agni Purāṇa' and 'Hayaśirṣapañcharātra'[12] uniformly refer to *Meru*, *Mandara*, *Vimāna*, *Nandivardhana*. *Ṣarvatobhadra* and add to this list of six *Bhadra*, *Ruchaka* and *Śrīvatsa* totalling nine forms of *Nāgara* temples. The 'Matsya Purāṇa' mentions terms as convincing attributes of a specific style of architecture, which theoretically seems sound enough to suggest that speculation about the style (rīti) first began in the Paurāṇic class of literature than elsewhere. Such terms along with thir specific proportions, namely *bhitti*, *garbha* (*gṛha*), *prāggrīva*, *maṇḍapa*, *mukha-maṇḍapa*, *pradakṣiṇā*, *kapāla*, *mañjarī*, *sukanāśa*, *vedibandha*, *kaṇṭha*, *amalasara*, *dvāra* and *dvāramūla*, etc., as the constituents of a (Nāgara) 'Prāsāda' show that there was awareness about the constituents of temple style and the knowledge of these constituents made people possible for a general deduction of a particular style. This concept of style is not discussed in any of the 'Purāṇas' in relation to sculpture. Probably sculpture grouped along with the genesis of the temple style to which they belonged. One more reason may be forwarded in this context. The universality of sculptural style of the age (5th–6th century A.D.) is responsible that our theorists did not distinguish the respective regional sculptural style. But in the field of painting the attempt of classifying the type and style was made as we shall see shortly.

The sculptural art in terms of iconometerey and iconography in signficantly explained in the 'Matsya Purāṇa'. As pedantic units of measurement the compilers give the lists of micro-units such as *reṇu* (ch. 257.17), but the basic *māna* which was applied was *aṅgula* and *tāla*. This was important change in the concept of measurement from the point of view of practibility. The concept of *ucchrāya* (elevation), *bhāga*, *pariśisṭha*, *nīcha*, *nīchocchrita*, *ūrdhva*, *unnatogra*, *vistara*, *tulya*, *pṛsta*, *anta*, *antara*, *sama*, *madhya*, *pariṇāha* etc. gave new dimensions to the concept of figuration in sculpture as well as in painting.

The chapters 258–266 of the 'Matsya Purāṇa' deal the iconometrey, measurement and the respective bodily proportion of the gods in terms of *aṅgula* and *tāla*, iconography (pratimālakṣaṇa) of different gods in iconic forms, specification relating the iconic entities of gods (liṅga) the pedestals (pīthikā) instalation, conseration (pratiṣṭhā and adhivāsana), the qualification and required merits of the *sthāpakas*, the artist[13]. The *sthāpaka* or *āchārya*, according to this text must fulfill certain ethical and mental qualities (daṁbha lobha vivarjita, subhākṛti, sauchāchāraparaḥ, pākhaṇḍakulaniṣpṛḥ, samaḥ śatrau cha mittre etc.) of noble birth and a brāhmaṇa (dvijachaiva kulīnaḥ) learned (sarvāyavasampūrṇao vedamantraviśāradaḥ, Purāṇavettā, tattvajña etc.) and over all proficient in the *vāstuśāstra* (Vāstuśāstrasya pāragaḥ). These qualities and qualifications of an artist bring this point to light that the moral and mental virtues are the pre-requisites of an artist, and with this their creations were also to be virtuous and thus this concept about an artist was sure to establish a kind of moral relationship between the artist and his art. Some other 'Purāṇas' which preserve the oral tradition of art and aesthetics are 'Nārada', 'Brahmāṇḍa,' 'Bhaviṣya,' 'Liṅga,' 'Vāyu,' 'Skanda' and 'Agni'. In such 'Purāṇas' the iconographical notes are given in the *dhyāna* and *stutis* and the matter relating to architecture also. In the 'Garuḍa Purāṇa' the chapters 46 and 47 deal with architecture and chapters 47 and 48 describe the *pratimālakṣaṇa* in the tradition of 'Matsya Purāṇa. P. K. Acharya has noted the significance of 'Skanda Purāṇa, particularly of Vaiśṇava Khaṇḍa (section 2) and Māhesvāra khaṇḍa) section 2).[14] The main significance of this 'Purāṇa' lies in the fact that beside dealing the traditional material on architecture and iconography it has attempted to establish relationship of Architecture with painting and incorporated crafts such as making chariots etc. into art.

The significance of 'Agni Purāṇa' not only lies in the elaborated discussion on the matter relating to formal aesthetics, but also in considering some problems, equally valid for art and poetics. The compilers mainly attempted to collect the possible traditions into one and gave not only the elaborate treatment but also emphasised the ritualistic aspect of art and architecture. The impact of 'Hayaśīrṡapañcharātra and 'Haribhaktivilāsa' is very much obvious on the text. The treatment and application of poetics as aestheties, seem to be a later addition, as the concept of *rīti* of Bhāmaha finds its adoption in the 'Agni Purāṇa'. The concept of *bhāva* (emotion) and *rasa* (aesthetic experience in the form of relish). also has its impact on the aesthetic theory of 'Agni Purāṇa'.

The subject-matter of the texts begin with the methodology of *maṇḍala* (sarvatobhadra maṇḍala) and the units of measure (ch. 29–30), purpose and methods of instalation of temple (ch. 38), determination of places) of goddess with temple, *bhū-śodhana* and units of measurement (ch. 39), rituals and archi tecture, (ch. 40) *prāsādalakṣaṇa* and *sthāpana* (ch. 41–42) again determining the position of respective gods on the respective sides of temple, material of image-making, their bodies proportion and related ceremonies (ch. 44), construction of pedestal of images (pinḍikā) (ch. 45), description of inconic form of Viṣṇu (Śālgrāma) and its form of worship (ch. 46-47), and also of *liṅga* (ch. 53–54), account of Vaiṣṇava gods and goddesses (ch. 48–50) and other forms of gods of *Śaiva* and *Śākta* nature (ch. 50–56) etc. Important iconograyhic material we get in some more chapters also. The chapter 339 is significant from the point of view of its brief discussion on the theory of *rasa* and *bhāva* points out certain significant observations from the point of view of aesthetic postulations. In view of the elaborate rules of imagery as well as poetics it has been boldly stated that 'here in this infinite world of creation (kāvyasaṁśare) only tha poet is Prajāpati (kavireva Prajāpatiḥ) and he can change the creation according to his own choice[15]. This is applicable not only to poet but also to an artist dealing with *Śilpa.* By creating art he enjoys *Sahaja-ānanda.*[16] Without *bhāva* any creation is devoid of aesthetic quality and from such creations no aesthetic experience can be derived. Therefore, the emotive basis of art is signified. A brief account of *aṅgakarma* (ch. 341) in dance and drama describing the movements and positions of various limbs, kinds of movements of eye-brows, kinds of looks, position of hands (mudrā) indicate that these are the significant constituents of beautiful from and expressions relevant to *abhinaya* and *nṛtya* as well as to *śilpa.* The 'Agni Purāṇa' refers to 13 kinds of head actions, 7 kinds of movement of eye-brows, 44 kinds of looks and 24 kinds of hand-poses (ch. 341). But as pointed earlier, in dealing the subject of *śilpa,* the compiler has attached importance to rituals, which were to be followed at every step, of creation, begining from *dāruchayana* (Pratimārth vanaṁgatvā vanayāga samācharet ch. 43.16) or *silā-chayana* to *prāṇapratiṣṭhā* and columination with *adhivāsana.* Accepting that *pratimā tu puruṣaḥ* it is stated that *Hareḥ sānnidhya karaṇamadhivāsana muchyate* (59.1). Such rituals, do not bring only the magical sanctity to images but also bring the devotee nearer to 'Absolute Being' which is the source all bliss and delight (sahaja-ānanda) as stated in the 'Agni Purāṇa' (339.1). At relevant places the symbolism of art forms is also indicated. It is interesting to note that ritual relating to worship of *lepyachitra* (wall painting) is also mentioned in the text (ch. 97.78–79). 'Agni Purāṇa', in the tradition of 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' seems to have made distinction between *lepyachitra* and *chitra.* The latter denotes sculpture.

The nature of aesthetics of the *Paurāṇic* tradition is significant from the point of view of its practical application. It gives more an outline to artists what to create rather than how to create. The inter-relationship of sculptural art with architecture is more realised than painting or dance or drama. The ritualistic considerations and the cult application was the main theme of the

'Purāṇas' than the pure technical considerations. The *Paurāṇic* texts though very rich in repertory of figures, shape, ornaments, emblems, gestures and positions, give no adequate direction for the rendering of non-cult sculptures and decorations (prāsādabhūṣaṇa). There is less stress on movement than the figures in the rest condition. Logically therefore individual figures superseed over the group-representations, though in contemporary arts, narrative panels are favourely rendered. Precepts do not refer to the natural setting of the images and they are demanded to be rendered in the prescribed moods (bhāva), gestures (mudrā) and bodily movement (bhaṅgimā and sthāna). The sculptors though made aware of the religious sensibility, they are left unaided interms of aesthetic concretisation of the *bhāva*—the images were required to depict.

There is certainly advance in the treatment of practice and postulates of plastic art in the 'Viṣṇudharmottara'. The compiler has certainly taken a broad view of art and its related matter and has discussed not only music and dance as prelude to pictoral and sculptural art but also the grammer and poetics[17]. The inter-relationship of pictoral art and dance is so intimately realised that without any reservation it is declared that 'as in dance, so in painting'. (Yathānṛtte tathāchitre V. D. III 36.5). Further, it is explained that 'the glances, the moods, the limbs and all their auxiliaries, the disposition of hands. . . . in dance . . . are to be shown as existing in art as well, as dance is art-supreme. (Ta eva chittre vijñeyā nṛtyaṁ chitraṁ paraṁ mataṁ. V. D. III 35.7). It was rather considered necessary tuat an artist mnst know dance (vinā tu nṛtya-śāstreṇa chitrasūtraṁsudurvidaṁ, V. D. III, 2-5).

The awareness of the intimacy of dance an art opened a new vista for aesthetic realisation, and visualization in plastic and pictoral art, which was so far conceived in the rigid formulas of cult art and also in terms of isolation. Dance provided movement to rigid, iconic cult art and the knowledge of dance was not only far providing the art objects the postures and gestures of body and limbs but also the movements of the breath within the body. In order to show the former, the rules of foreshortening are taught, inorder to show the latter, subtleties of shading had to be mastered by which the body and limbs were given only deceptively volumetric fulness but their planes appeared as if expanding by breathing and throbbing with the pulsations of life. Moreover, the dancers experience of the flux of movement carried by the body was communicated to the quality of line, its flowing continuity and modelling sinsuosity. This is the observation of Stella Kramrich in case of painting.[18] The dance also provided aesthetic character to sculpture in the same manner and the cult forms not only adopted movements in within but also appeared in dancing poses. Static figures gained movement and rhythm in some way or the other, at the same time the figures fixed in the prescription of *tālamāna* also received variations. The features of physique were determined on the basis of the behaviour and status. Images were conceived as the symbolic representation of the various exuberances of beauty, relishable in the various forms of experiences. The object of our worship now no longer remained as gross figure or the mere feature but became the entities of relish and happiness.

The figures merely based on *tālamāna* were given movement of multidimensional facets on the basis of grouping of ethentic and other types, and *sthānas*. The five groups suggested in the 'Viṣṇudharmottara'-*Haṁsa*, *Bḥadra*, *Mālavya*, *Ruchaka* and *Śasaka*[19] represent the ideal norms of ethenic and psysiognomical types over and above the vast repertory of figures-divine and human, abnormal and gortesque and the nine poses ('nava sthānāni rūpāṇāṁ, V. D. III. 39. 1)' namely *Ṛjvāgata*, *anṛju*, *sāchīkṛta-śarīra*, *ardhaviloehanu*, *pārśvagata*, *priṣṭhāgata*, *paravṛtta* and *samānata*.[20] These poses greatly differ with each other and when added with some special poses such as *ālīḍha*, *prātyalīḍha* etc. as well as the *karṇas* and *mudrās* (specially as borrowings from 'Nāṭyaśāstra' of Bharata) along with the foreshortening technique presented a new world of articulated figures under a comprehensive concept of plastic form. Awarness of Nature and its setting in relation to form is a significant feature of 'Viṣṇudharmottara' which has breaked the monotonous scheme of isolated icons and suggested that the painter (valid for sculptor also) should study the picture and mood of nature and depict the seasons as he sees aroud him the flowers and fruits on trees and the joy and happiness of men, animals and birds, (V. D. III 42. 80). There is a whole chapter (ch. 42) which suggests a plan of depiction of man and god in the natural envoirnment and Stella Kramrich points out, it may be taken for granted that the artist would know how to integrate the scene and convey its implied context by its composition.[21] Nature cannot be adopted in art as it is, therefore, idealised form of nature was presented in Indian art. The practical application of the text is in the manner of suggestion not in the manner of technical detail, for which the actual artist and his tradition was compitent. The artist in Indian (Sthāpaka or ācharya) was not an ignorant being, on the contrary an enlightent one as we guess from the qualifications prescribed for him in the texts, and he was expected to be a knowledgeable person besides being expert in the *Vāstuvidyā*.[22] His perfection in his profession of technical arts, may however be either innate or acquired.

The 'Viṣṇudharmottara', however suggests three standards of portrayal. First the traditional standards according to the fixed formula of *tālamāna*, *sthāna* etc. The second actual standard of portrayal under the concept of *rūpaṁ yad yasya dṛśyate* (III 42. 57). For this, there is general instruction in regard to portrayal of the sky, earth, mountains, forests, water, towns, villages, fortresses, shopping-centres, taverns, gambling courts, battle-fields, cemeteries, caravans of camels, mules laden with merchandise etc. The third standard deals with suggestive and symbolic forms, more commonly by way of personification.

In the first catagory besides the cult figures of the traditional repertory as in the 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' and the 'Purāṇas', the concept of *Chakravartī* and *mahārāja* were added together with his *mantrī*, *purohita*, *senāpati*, *yoddhā*, *paurajānapada*, *śreṣṭhi* even dancers, musicians and drunkers. (ch. 42). They are to be depicted after a close observations and study of the difference in features (rūpaṁ), dress, (veśaṁ), ornamentation, complexion (varṇa) and their special characteristics (deśe deśe narāḥ kāryā yathāvatsamudbhavaḥ, ch. 42. 49). The artists should be particular about their country (deśaṁ) inclination (niyoga), position (sthāna), profession (karma), seat (āsana), bed (śayana), vehicles (yāna), dress (veśa) etc. (ch. 42. 50).

The difference between the second and the third catagories, have been ably demonstrated and at length. Accepting the principle that similitude is the very essence of art (sādṛśyakarṇaṁ pradhānaṁ, 42. 48) it has been demonstrated for instance, mountains are to be shown in their natural form with clusters of large boulders, peaks mineral deposits, wild growth of trees, torrents, waterfalls and serpents. In the '*rūpaṁyad*' catagory, the same theme is to be illustrated in the *Śarīrī* or *saśarīrāṇaṁ* form as the noble male figures, with the peaks in hands; (parvatāścha tathā rājaṁstathā śikharapāṇayaḥ 42. 53).

Leaving otber details of mode of depiction suggested in the 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' we may consider here two hints of the text about the perfect depiction. First is the point of situation. It is said, 'having appropriately and satisfactorily contemplated on these measurement (pramāṇa) in accordance with the respective forms (rūpa), their stances (sthāna), and flexion (karṇas), their appropriate background (sthirabhūmilaṁbhaiḥ) the figures are to be drawn in masterly stroke of line work. (37. 17). The eight merits[23] of painting—appropriate stance (sthāna), proportion (pramāṇa), background (bhūlaṁbha sweet-execution (madhuratava), distinctive symmetry (vibhaktatā), semblance (sādṛśya) and fereshortening (kṣayavṛddhi) also apply to sculptural art. The perfection of execution may be determined by the background which suits the portrayal and almost embraces it being appropriate (lasatīva cha bhūlaṁbha ṣliyatīva tathā) sweet execution almost smiles (hasatīva chamādhuryaṁ) and the figures seem to be alive and breathing (sajīva eva dṛśyate 43. 19-21).

The second point is related with minute observation and differenciations not only of forms but in the situation in which the difference between a sleeping (suptaṁ cha chetanāyuktaṁ) and a dead (mṛtaṁ chaitanya vivarjitaṁ) is clearly deleneated in art (43-29).

All these artistic achievements by an artist depend only if he himself has understood the secrets of *rasa* and *bhāva* (42. 81) and *kalpnā* (40. 17). All these he can do with perfection not through tutoring but by the aquisition and refinement of his own intelegence (svabuddhayā). Else where it is said that 'bhāvārādhana' is the most difficult task for an artist and only *atividagdhas* can be successful in the task, (duṣkaraṁ hi chitre bhāvārādhandaṁ).[24] There are various *guṇas* and *doṣas*, merits and defects, defined and described in the *Chitrasūtra.* These merits and defects were very well taken care of by the artist who attempted at sculpturing or painting.

We have referred to above that the non-cononical literature other than the 'Purāṇas' also deal with the material relating to sculpture and architecture in different contexts. The 'Nāṭya Śāstra' elaborately illustrate the *sthānas*, *mudrās* and the concept of *rasa*. In the 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' (6th century A. D.) we find chapters dealing with architecture, measurement and cult-figures in the astronomical and astrological context. In the chapter 56 'Bṛhat saṁhitā' ennumerates twenty types of temples, mentioned above which had its impact on the classifications of temples in the 'Matsya Purāṇa' (ch. 209). 'Bhaviṣya Purāṇa' (ch. 130) and also in 'Agni' and 'Garuḍa Purāṇas'. The latter refers to forty five types of temples broadly catagorised as *Vairāja chaturasra* (square). *Puṣpaka-āyataḥ* (rectangular) *Kailāśa vṛtta* (round), *Māṇikavṛttā-yataḥ* (oval) and *Triviṣṭapa aṣṭasra* (octangular). The list of 'Viṣṇudharmottara' exceeds all and mentions one hundred and one types. It appears that *Sarvatobhadra* type (ch. 87) is seperated from *Himvat* variety which includes ninenty nine sub-temple types (ch. 86), commonly enumerated in other lists of the 'Purāṇas'. The significance of 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' is not only in the elaborate classification of temple-types but also in giving the proportionate relationship of different elements of temples and also in determining the specific proportions of images to be set on the doors and the walls of the temple.

The other chapters of 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' describe preperation of *vajralepa* (ch. 57), standard units of measure and cult icons of Rāma, Viṣṇu, Baladeva, Ekāṁsā, Śāmba, Pradumn, Brahmā, Indra, Kārttikeya, Śiva, Buddha, Sūrya, Liṅga, Sapta-mātrikas, Revanta, Yama, Varuṇa, Kubera and Gaṇeśa (ch. 58). Chapter 59 is devoted to the collections of wood and chapter 60 describes the rules of *pratiṣṭhā*. In the 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' there is no reference to *tālamāna* and the basic unit is described as *aṅgula*.

There is very important contribution of the secterian class of literature to the iconology of their faith, known as *āgamas* and *saṁhitās*. The nature of their contribution do not deviate much from the traditional material as we have noticed in the 'Purāṇaś. In such *āgamas* and *saṁhitas* the significant point lies on emphasis and details of icon types and also represent to some extent the regional variations. The antiquity of such literature dealing the subject goes near about the 4th-5th centuries and continue till late. The *āgama* literature is either devoted to *Śaiva* cult or to the *Vaiṣṇava* cults. *Vaiṣṇavite āgamas* seems to be earlier than the *Śaivāgamas*. The *āgamas* which traditionally believed to be eight in in number, are as significant and comprehensive in the South as the 'Purāṇas' in the North. They present the subject matter more scientifically than even some of the 'Purāṇas'. From the point of view of traditional material of art and aesthetics, the 'Kāmikāgama', 'Suprabhedāgama', 'Karṇāgama', 'Vaikhānasāgama' ascribed to Mārīchi and Attri, 'Vaikhānasīya' 'Kaśyapa jñānakāṇda (Kaśyapa Saṁhitā), 'Aṁsumadbhedāgama' (which includes 'Kaśyapīya' or 'Kaśyapasaṁhitā' as a part of it), are most significant. They present by way of physical or formal facts of art from the point of view of their aesthetic utility devoted to the service of particular sect of Brahmanical religion, most specifically to Śaivism. In the same tradition we may consider the *Saṁhitās*, such aś Śātvata, 'Pauṣkara' 'Ahirbudhanya', 'Khilādhikāraṁ' of Bhṛgu, 'Attri Saṁhitā.' 'Hayaśīrśapañcharātra' etc. particularly devoted to Vaiṣṇavism. Of these texts, the Kriyāpāda is very much relevant to the formal deleneation of art in the ritualistic contexts. The dates of *Āgamas* and *Saṁhitās* range from 6th-7th to 12th centurary A. D. or even later. Some Vaiṣṇavite *Āgamas* are post Ramānuja. Though secterian texts, they have universal application to imagery. The source of the texts in most cases are the earlier literary and religious authorities and the traditions, prevalent among the artists and their schools. Such asā the 'Kāmikāgama' is the ancient most '*Āgama*' of the Śaivite cult, 'Vaikhānasāgama' is of the Vaiṣṇavite. The number of *Pañcharātra* texts is much more than what is available to us. Essentially their anthologies are related to temple-building, iconometry and iconology devoted to their sects and regional worship. They give more emphasis to the rules which are meticulously to be followed by the devotees in temple-building and cult image-worship. These texts render similar service to their faith as the traditional literature, such as 'Purāṇas' to all Brahmanical religions. They show their deep intimacy with the specific artistic traditional aphorisms as collected in the authorative *Śilpa* texts. *Śaivāgamas* present the early southern tradition of art and architecture and *Vaikhānasāgam*as represent the northern tradition. But their approach is more related to the religious sensibility than to direct aesthetic experience. Same is true about the *Tāntric* texts, such as 'Kiraṇa Tantra', 'Brahmayāmalaṭantra' (containing Picumata), 'Jayadrathayāmalatantra' (containing Piṅgalamata). Both have *pratimādhikaraṇas* and deal *tālamāna, mudrā* (Gesturology), iconography as the inseparable part of Indian concept of aesthetics as known from the canonical texts. The role of *Tāntric* texts is significant in one way that they incorporate in their bulk hundreds of divine forms, which were not described commonly in the traditional iconographic texts, but emerged powerfully as the local deities. Incorporating these deities of local and regional popularity and worship some of these texts classified the *Tāntric* images into four grades (I) super divine (II) the divine (III) the divine as non divine and (IV) the mundane.[25] Through these grades of gods and icon-types the *Tāntric* texts set variety of artistic models, supreme among them were the *nṛtyamūrties*, the symbol of aesthetic dynamism. The *Tāntric* emblems, symbols, hand poses, the positions and attitudes, the facial expression etc. of the *Tāntric* divinities represent visually the manifold *Tāntric* philosophical concepts, which otherwise were hidden. Such texts have intimate relationship not only with art forms but with their aesthetic symbolism and meaning.

The digests and *pratiṣṭhā granthas* such as Raghunandana's '*Pratiṣṭhātantra*' and '*Kṛtyakalpatara*' of Hemādri also have much significance with reference to iconography and art. The former is more specific about the instalation of images and the latter is, besides the instalation, related to worship and meditation. The nature of Buddhist ritualistic works, such as *Sādhanāmālas*, 'Niṣpannayogāvalī', 'Guhyasamājatantra', 'Tathāgataguhyaka', 'Advayavajrasaṁgarah' etc. slightly differs with the *dhyāna* texts of the Brahmaninical cononical works. Like the Brahmanical *dhyānas* and *stotras* they do not merely present the *lakṣaṇas* but also add the aesthetic notes for the guidance of the artists. Mobilly and the dynamism are the key notes of the *Tāntric* forms manifested by way of *mudrās, sthānas* and attitudes. The aesthetic notes are suggested through the scheme of colours and the facial expression, which constitutes the figure in the nature of placid or violent and often in terms of *rasa.* The nature of indications are quite clear and accordingly the attributes of both the types of images are suggested. Thus, if Vasudhārā is described as 'kanakavarṇaṁ sakalālaṅkāravatīṁ dviraṣṭavarṣākṛtiṁ daksiṇakarenavardaṁ, vāmakareṇa dhāñyamañjarīdharaṁ' etc. (Sādhanamālā, p. 421). Nairātmā is described in quite a contrary manner suggesting that she should be shown 'kṛṣṇāṁ, ūrdhvapiṅgalakeśaṁ daṁṣṭrākarālalolajjihvāṁ, dakṣiṇena kartaridhāriṇīṁ, vāme kapālakhaṭvāṅgadhāriṇiṁ, raktavartulatrinetraṁ' etc. (Sādhanamāla, p. 451). Hints to beauty is suggested here and there with reference to the individual images as *sarvāṅgasundaraṁ*, *śāṅkatulyaśobhaṁ*, *smitvikasitavadanaṁ* etc. on one hand and with refrence to specific *rasas* on the other. Thus, in case of Sukhāvatī Lokeśvara there is reference to *saśṛṅgārarasotsava*, in case of Hayagrīva there is refrence to *krodha* and *lajjā bhāvas*, and with reference to Aparchana there is suggestion for *Śṛṅgāra rasa*. In one image how various *rasas* and *bhāvas* should be shown is indicated in case of Trailokyavijaya. Thus it is suggested that of the four faces (chaturamukhaṁ) should show the *rasa* and *bhāvas* of *krodha*, *śṛṅgāra*, *raudra*, *bībhatsa* and *vīra*. (Sādhanamālā, p. 511). Such examples can be multiplied which incorporates *harṣa*, *hāsya* etc. In addition to these, we have innumerable refrences which instruct that images should be decked with elaborate ornaments etc. (bibhūṣayantaṁ vividhālaṁkāravastravibhūṣaṇaṁ).

The Jain anthologies of art and aesthetics can be catagorised into three groups :—

I. The works which are early but deal the subject by way of references and have marginal utility from the point of view of aestetics. The 'Kalpasūtra', 'Aṅgavijjā', 'Paumacharitaṁ', 'Vasudevahindi', 'Āvasyakachūrṇī' etc. are of encyclopedic nature but they contain little about the aestheitcs.

II. The Chaturaviṁśatikā, 'Chaturviṁśatistotra', 'Nirvāṇakālikā, Triṣaṣṭhiśalākāpuruṣacharita', 'Mantrādhirājakalpa', 'Chaturviṁśati jinacharita', 'Pravachanasāroddhāra', 'Āchāradinkara', 'Harivaṁśa Purāṇa', 'Ādi Purāṇa', 'Uttarapurāṇa', 'Pratiṣṭhāsaṁgraha', 'Pratiṣṭhāsaroddhāra' etc. are useful for the iconographic notes.

III. Specific Jain *śilpa* texts such as 'Aparājitapṛcchā' and the works of maṇḍana.

But the basic principles of Jainism, such as *Śīla* and *Ahiṁsā*, produced the controlling effect on the art and iconographic forms and aesthetic forms and aesthetic principles characterised by the simple and unsensuous forms as opposed to the *Tāntric* forms. Such aesthetic norms of Jain art were fully abiding to the principles of grace and beauty.

'Śukranīti' as very significant text of *nīti* which deals with new concepts of art and aesthetics. The dating of the text is a matter of controversy, ever since it was brought to the knowledge of scholars. Oppert classed it to the time of *Smṛtis*, while V.S. Agrawala placed it in the Gupta period. Rajendra Lal Mittra did not assign a date earlier than the 16th Century A. D. and lastly L. Gopal[26] with very cogent and valid reasionings placed the text in the first half of the 19th Century A, D. To him, the text had its origin in the Marāṭhā State, Baroda. Most of the legal matter and the administrative system suggested in the text, as Prof. L. Gopal observes is identical to the system of judiciary and administration as enforced under the East India Company. About the matter related to art and architecture he has not discussed in his enduring work. Most of the authorities hold that this *nīti* texts belongs to South India.

Coomarswami[27] was first to analyse the text in relation to the Indian aesthetics.The text though not devoted to *Śilpa*, some passages dealing with the making of images embody very definite statements on aesthetics principles. The nature of aesthetics in the 'Śukranīti', according to Coomarswami is scholastic, probably because the author has presented the description of art and architecture by way of injunctions. But in the very first note the author introduces certain positive principles of *dhyāna, yoga* (practice) *kauśala* (ability to create) andvisual contemplation. These principles indicate the relationship of the artist with the art object (pratimā) and also make such positive statement that it is not *pratyakṣa* (direct observation) but through visual contemplation and imagination that the end of art can be achieved and aesthetic experience can be derived. As a guide-line to an imager that the linements (lakaṣaṇas) of images are prescribed in the text.

The text, however, does not represent the dogmatic views of South Indian texts such as *āgamas* or the 'Śilpaīantra'. The nature of description is comparatively nearer to north Indian tradition as in the 'Purāṇas' and other *Śilpa* texts. The concept of *dhyāna* in the text is not purely the religious meditation of a worshipper, but a true kind of artistic contemplation, necessary for all artistic creations. In the portion dealing with imagery the text is conscious of artist's liberty not only in concretisation of of visual contemplation but also in creation of beauty in the image. He suggests three fold approaches to the art of image-making. One prescreptive, which determines the form of traditional nature. The second of a devotee in which minor avoidance of prescriptions is to be ignored on the basis that it suits to devotee or such shortcomings can be rectified by the devotee himself through his own devotional aptitude. Despite he suggests at very many times in the texts that the images should be within the *māna* and with *lakṣaṇas*, the relationship of image and the devotee be determined by the artist on the basis of *Sevaka-sevyesu bhāva*, (and not merely by prescriptions). The third is very significant that the image must be a piece of art. Here he indicates the artistic approach, which has rarely been touched in other texts, discussed above. In other words, the author determines the qualities of a perfect image not only in the formal qualities as achieved through the principle of *lakaṣaṇas* and *tālamānas*, but also by its inherent beauty (Śobhā). Since the qualities of beauty is inexplicit and the standard of judgement also varies the author leaves to the skill (pāṭava) of artist to bring this element into the image which he calls *Śobhā* and *ramyatā*.

This is entirely a new textual latitude to Indian artist and a singular contribution to the art and aesthetics. This is not a valid judgement of Coomarswami that Śukrāchārya has propounded a purely scholastic conception of what is lovely or beautiful, and nowhere admits the validity of individual taste.[28] On the contrary he vary clearly points out that the judgement of beauty is determined, as pointed earlier, by a kind of relationship of nature (bhāva) of *sevya* and *sevaka* ie., a connoisseur of religious sensibility. This *bhāva* itself is the source of *pratimā lakaṣaṇa* (IV. 4. 160). The defect of art (pratimā-doṣa) vanishes if it does not effect the *chitta* (IV 4. 161). Though the figure of real beauty is rare (kaschit-lakṣe), the figure which is beautiful according to the *Śāstras*, may be considered as beautiful (ramya). Here the *Śastramāna* may be taken for the conventional notion of beauty, and that which is exclusively determined by prescriptions of *tāla-mānas* and *pratimā lakaṣaṇas*.

According to the 'Śukranīti', bodily proportion and its organic unity is the vital element which constitute beauty. One should contrive for every member such grace (pāṭava) as is appropriate. The image is said to be lovely (ramya) which is neither more or less than the prescribed proportion. The vains of the hands and feet should not be shown, nor should the ankle-bones be seen. Those parts of images are said to be really lovely (suśobhaṁ), which are neither more or less in proportion than the limbs of such images as have been made by experts, and every member that is neither too thick nor thin will be altogether pleasing (sarvamanoharaṁ, IV. 4. 104).

Only in the context of organic unity and religious applicability of image (as a creation of art) the author provides the details of bodily relationship within the system of *tālamāna*, which ultimately constitutes the element of *śobhā*, and what is the real thing of beauty, 'even if one captivates the heart (Ekesāmeva tad ramyaṁ lagnaṁ yatra cha yasya hṛt. IV 4. 108).

In this texts two levels of perception of beauty is suggested. One for divine images, which is visualized through contemplation (dhyāna). The other is through direct perception, which is for worldly objects. But in any case the *dhyānayoga* is essential for visualization of art-object. The mystery of image and its iconographic features (pratimālakṣaṇa) lies in the meditation by the imager and it is clearly stated that the prescribed *lakṣaṇas* are nothing other than the contemplative entities of the *chitta* of the imager (pratimākāra). Like a *yogī* he meditates about the images of the god and thus the very source of *pratimālakṣaṇa* is nothing but *dhyānayoga* (IV. 74). It is further said that visualization even of *pratyakṣa* is not possible in art unless it is the product of contemplation (dhyāna). In the 'Śukranīti' the attempt to classify the divine images is also made. While the portraiture of human being is condemned as leading to hell and inasupicious (aśubha), the divine images are classified into three groups—*sattava, raja* and *tama*. The images showing *yogamudrā*, and naturalistically rendered, adorned by the devotees and with *vara* and *abhaya* poses belong the *sattiva* class of images. The deities decked with ornaments and sitting on *vāhanas*, holding various weapons and emblems and also with *vara* and *abhaya* poses are *rājasī* class of *pratimā*. The images, furious in nature and with deadly weapons and in attacking attitude to demons, belong to the *tāmasī* class. The visualisation of the three above mentioned classes of gods and goddesses, fundamentally depend not merely on the iconographic features, but on the three mental attitudes, depending upon the functional necessity of divine being in the context of a devotee. Such classification neither effect the style and nature of image, nor make any positive catagorization, for any deity. This classification, on the basis of the three *guṇas*, advocated also in various other texts, as a matter of fact, denote the three mental situations in which a god is perceived.

References

1. Tarapada·Bhattacharya, *Canons of Indian Art*, p. 99
2. *Śukranīti*, IV. 3. 29
3. *Canons of Indian Art*, p. 114
4. *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 15; II. 80; V. 7, 12 and 14
5. *Canons of Indian art*, p. 117
6. *Arthaśāstra*, ch. IV
7. *Canons of India Art*, p. 120.
8. Niharranjan Ray in *Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 509
9. Stella Kramrich, *Indian Sculpture*, p. 11
10. *Canons of Indian Art*, p. 127–128
11. Ibid., pp. 444–445
12. Ibid., p. 448
13. *Matsya Purāṇa* (more edition), ch. 264, 1–6, p. 734
14. D. L. Mishra, *Bhāratīya Sthāpatya*, p. 35
15. *Agni Purāṇa* (more edition), 331, 10
16. Ibid., 339, 1.
17. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, III, ch. 1–34
18. Stella Kramrich in *Chitrasūtraṁ*, p. IX
19. See for detail *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāna*, III. 36. 1–6
20. Ibid., III. 39. 2
21. Stella Kramrich in *Chittrasūtra*, p. X
22. Supra. p. 61
23. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, III. 43. 19.
24. Upamitbhavaprapaṅkhakathā, p. 876; *Chitrasūtra*, P. 112.
25. Elements of Indian Aesthetics, Vol. II, pt. I, p. XIX.
26. '*Śukranīti-a nineteenth century Text*, pp. 67. 72
27. Transformation of Nature in Art, p. 113.
28. Ibid., p. 117.

V

Nature of Aesthetics in Canonical Literature

There is no radical difference in the nature of treatment of the aesthetic material in the *Śilpa* texts from the nature of approach in the non-canonical texts, above discussed. But with the advance of time there is widening and maturity of knowledge of *Vāstuvidyā* in the exclusive *Śilpa* texts, which instead being sectarian represent an universal approach to art and aesthetics.[1] Such texts embody the great effort made during the several years to compile the *vāstu* and scattered material in exclusive texts on *Śilpavidyā*. This academic movement gained momentum in and after 10th century A. D., but prior to this date certain texts are ascribed. We have already referred to the newly discovered texts 'Vāstusūtra Upaniṣad'. It is a problematic text ftom the point of view of dating as well as the nature of the subject matter treated in the text. Unlike the other '*Śilpa* texts, which confine to *tālamāna*, this text gives emphasis on compositional factors of sculpture. Under the concept of *pañjara*, As observed above,[2] the 'Vāstusūtra Upaniṣad' has analysed the problem and relationship of *rūpa* and *pratirūpa* and discusses the principles of origin and ultimate purpose of 'form' and the metaphysical concept behind *rūpa* and *rekhā*. As contrary to the canonical treatment of 'form' as a 'physical fact' it discusses the subject by revealing the 'professional secret' of imagery, whose composition is consistingly based on concentric space. Compositional scheme of *pañjara* reveal an abstract symbolism, corresponding to various aspects of the divinities, characterised by their actions and attributes, that was contained in very lines of their outlay, and that it was by a precise juxtraposition and interweaving of the illustrative elements with these fundamentat patterns the striking synthesis was found.[3]

Since this text forms a class by itself we have discussed it at the other occassions, without going into the details of its chronological aspect.

Traditionally Nagnajit is considered as one of the earliest authority on painting. His 'Chitralakṣaṇa' in the present form, cannot be dated earlier than the 6th century A. D. and is devoted mainly to the canons of measurement and the principles of painting. He is also considered to be a great teacher of *Vāstuvidyā* who mastered the northern as well as the southern tradition of art and architecture. His exposition of the theoretical principles of painting shall be discussed elesewhere (in ch. VI).

The date of 'Mānasāra' as well as its authorship is difficult to determine. In the general consciousness the text which is of encyclopedic nature, is not the work of one authority or of one time. P. K. Acharya dates the text in the 'Gupta period' but Tarapada Bhattacharya places not before the 11th Century A. D.[4] The text has received most popular attention of the scholars who have studied the text, particularly its forty chapters dealing with the architecture. Its analysis of style clearly proves its bias on regional styles. It refers to thirty two authorities on '*Vāstuvidyā*' and its treatment of architectural material is suggestive of the fact that it refers to a phase of Indian architecture when it has assumed elaborate forms. Thus it refers to seventeen storeyed structures, described ninenty eight varieties of temples and consequently a large varieties of pedestals (36 upapīṭhas), bases (19 adhiṣṭhānas), pillars (12 types) and forty three types of *maṇḍapas* and 11 varieties of *Gopurams* and the varieties of mouldings. Thus, there is elaborations in the 'Mānasāra' over the traditional knowledge of architecture as known from the above mentioned non-canonical texts and also it superseeds the various *Śilpa* texts ascribed to north (Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra) and to south (Mayamataṁ or Mayamata Saṁgraha). The effort of widening the definition of *Vāstu* is also a remarkable feature of 'Mānasāra' which includes under the term not only the conventional features, such as *māna*, *bhūmichayana*, *bhūparikṣā*, *padavinyāsa*, *balikarma* etc. and the method of erection of *vimāna*, *prākāra*, *parikhā*, *gopura*, *maṇḍapa*, *śālā*, *dvāra*, *prāṅgaṇa*, *toraṇa*, *rājaveśma* etc., but also the furniture (bhavana-upaskara) such as *paryaṅka*, *saiyyā*, *mañjuṣā*, *piñjara* etc. First 8 chapters of 'Mānasāra, are introductory and then from 9 to 50 chapters deal from planning to the actual construction of *Vāstu* and the last ten chapters (from 51 to 70) describe imagery and iconographic details. While the temple architecture is considered as the matrix of Indian architecture, the town planning, village settlement etc. also are high lightened. Ritualistic aspects of *Vāstu* such as *balikarma–vidhāna*, *gṛhapraveśa-vidhi* also have been properly considered. The Technical aspects of *Vāstu* such as *sandhikarma* has been scientifically discussed and the spiritual and symbolic consideration of *padavinyāsa*, the concept of 'vāstupuruṣa' and 'vāstupuruṣa-maṇḍala', which have been thonght out since long, find elaboration in 'Mānasāra' thereby explaining the fundamental under-lying principles of 'Vāstuvidyā' in more lucid way.

'Mānasāra' together with 'Mayamatam' consider the *vāstu* as having four constinuents—*bhūmi*, the ground, *prāsāda*, the temple or palace, *yāna* the conveyance and *śayana* the couch (Mayamatam, II, 1–3). The *vāstu* however, is primarily the planned site of the building. Its shape is square as a rule and its full name is 'Vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala', which as the 'cosmic man' is the origin and source of 'existence and through material cause 'upādāna' identifies his existence with plan.[5] The plan makes the site of the building in his image which is his form in totality of his manifestation. The form of 'vāstumaṇḍala', as visualized traditionally by the architects is square, which can be converted into triangle, hexagon, octogen and circle. The relation of the 'vāstumaṇḍala to the site-plan, ground-plan and vertical section of any building is similar to that of the tonic and any musical composition and rhythms'. The concept of *chanda* (rhythm) is aesthetically significant which conditions the *vāstu* at two aspects—*tatalcchands* (rhythm of level) and the *ūrdhvacchanda* (the rhythm of elevation); implying the proportionate measurement which connects the ground-plan and the vertical sections of a building.[6]

Both square and circle have vedic origins and connected with the sacrificial altar and both areco-ordinated with each other in a perfect form of architecture. 'The square is the essentially and perfect form of Indian architecture. It pre-supposes the circle and results from it. Expanding energy shapes the circle from the centre; it is established in the form of square. The circle and curve belong to life in its growth and movement. The square is the mark of order, of finality to the expanding life, its form and of perfection beyond life and death.'[7]

The concept of 'vāstupada-devatā' in relation to 'vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala' considerably discussed in the non-canonical texts, such as 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā', 'Matsya Purāṇa' and 'Agni Purāṇa' etc. finds its fuller treatment in almost all the canonical texts from 'Mānasāra' to 'Śilparatna'. The division of *pada* (plots) before constructing the building of a temple is essential, but its determination is not always conditioned by the dimensions and the area available for the construction. Any area, of any extension of land, however, must be divided into squares, on the basis of intellectual intution, geometrically governed and astronomically and arithmetically sustained. 'The square, with reference to the level of earth, is the graph of the pair of opposites initially marked by sunrise and sunset and caused by the daily apparent movement of the sun. These successive and recurrent critical moments are given a permanence by the symbol of the suqare on which they are shown stationed opposite one another. The balance of their positions is mand conclusive by making the South and North points as the second corresponding pair of opposite and by connecting these points by straight line, are the intermediate direction North-East, South-East and soforth, so that by a geometrically progressive series, the original two points engender four and eight, sixteen and thirty two. These stations are marked along the outline of the square diagram; 32 divinities are assigned to the 32 fields in the outer border of the square. A cyclical sequence is held in the square by the pair of opposite. They encompass all manifestation, in terms of space as it is beheld on the level of the earth. This initial translation of the rhythm of line into a pattern in space forms the basis of larger cycles than that of the day; they also are supported by the square drawn by the gound.[8] Symbolically the 32 units, the abode of *pada-devatās*, actully are the spaces for the 32 *nakṣatras*. Over this icliptic concepts, in the later texts ‘such as ‘Mānasāra’, ‘Mayamatam’ and ‘Samarāṅgaṇa sūtradhāra’ there have been much modifications, so for the names and nature of thr *pada-devatās* are concerned. In the later texts, particularly in ‘Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra’ the ‘*pada-devatās* are very loosely connected with stars and *nakṣatras*. The *vāstumaṇḍala* which originally consisted 64 squares and 81 squares are the two main types, popularly applicable to temple architecture. The all pervading and omniform ‘Vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala’ lying on the ground sanctify the whole area specified for the erection of the *vāstu*, irrespective of its size on one hand and the various squared geometrically derived, on the other provide space for 32 gods in the outer border and Brahmā in the central square, thus totalling 33 gods. In addition, the 12 Ādityas also station in the magical diagram (squares) of the *vāstumaṇḍala* along with Sun and Moon. This series of *Vāstupada-devatā* specifies the plots (pada) for forty-five *devatās* of various orders.

The modification over this is suggested in the ‘Mānasāra’ which though initially follows the series of 32 *pada-devātās*, mentions different order and nature of names of such *devatās* with other details are tabulated here as follows :

Types	*Units of pada*	*Name of pada*
1	1	*Sakala*
2	4	*Paiśācha* or *Pechaka*
3	9	*Pīṭha*
4	16	*Mahāpīṭha*
5	25	*Upapītha*
6	36	*Ugrapīṭha*
7	49	*Sthaṇḍila*
8	64	*Chaṇḍita* also called *Maṇḍūka*
9	81	*Paramaśāyika*
10	100	*Āsana*
11	121	*Sthānīya*
12	144	*Deśya*
13	169	*Ubhayachaṇḍita*
14	196	*Bhadra*
15	225	*Mahāsana*
16	256	*Padamagarbha*
17	289	*Tryuta*
18	324	*Karṇāṣṭaka*
19	361	*Gaṇita*
20	400	*Sūrya Viśālaka*
21	441	*Susaṁhita*
22	484	*Supratikānta*
23	529	*Viśālaka*
24	576	*Vipragarbha*
25	625	*Viveśa*
26	676	*Vipulabhāga*
27	729	*Viprakānta*
28	784	*Viśālākṣa*
29	841	*Viprabhakti*
30	900	*Viśveśasāra*
31	961	*Iśvarakānta*
32	1024	*Chandrakānta*

All these thirty-two units, with a complex of geometrical arrangement present, different 'vāstupuruṣa-maṇḍala'. Some important units may be described here on the basis of 'Mānasāra' (ch. VII).

1. *Sakala :* hut useful for Yati, the four sides of the square representing *Āditya* (East), Yama (South), Varuṇa (West) and Chandra (North).
2. *Pechaka :* useful for *pūjāgṛha* of eight sides representing Śiva (N. E.), Agni (S. E.), Vāyu (S. W.), and Iśāna (or Gagana) in N. W. In other directions, it should be supplemented by the *Sakala* form and its *pada-devatās.*
4. *Mahāpīṭha :* ideal for temple site. In the centre, there is space for Brahmā, then begining from North-East (In the earlier tradition of 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā' from East itself) in two rows there are squares and half squares, prescribed for Apavatsa, Aryaka, Savitā, Vivasvata, Indra, Mittraka, Rudra, Bhūdhara, (in the interior row) and Īśa, Jayanta, Āditya, Bhṛśa, Kṛśānu, Vitana, Yama, Mṛgarāja, Pitra, Sugrīva, Varuṇa, Śiṣa or Soṣa, (a disease), Marut, Soma, Aditi (as bordering *pada-devatās*).

Since this *padavinyāsa* includes only 16 *padas*, one god is allotted in *half pada* thus 23 gods are stationed in 12 square centre and Brahmā alone is specified in central four units of four squares, remaining one half vacant. (Mānasāra, VII. 31-34)

'Mānasāra' is not comprehensive in giving the names of the *pada-devatās* for all kinds of *padavinyāsas* (ground plans). But in other form usually these names of gods are also included. They are Athavasta Indrarāja (besides Indra), Rudrajaya, Pūṣana, Agni, Dauvārika, Vāyu, Nāga, Gidhā (asura), Udita, Mahendra, Satya, Gandharva, Puspadanta, Charakī and Vidāri, Pūtanā (all demi goddess), Aryaman, Rudra, aya, Chandramā, Parjañya, Satyaka, Antarikṣa, Pūṣaṇa, Vitatha, Gṛhakṣata, Dharmadeva, Bhallāṭa, Īśāna. Their iconography and colours are vividly described in the 'Mānasāra' (ch. VII 78–126).

The 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' gives advance to the concept of *pada-devatā* and *vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala*. In this text there are three set of plot division (pada-vibhāga)—*padavāstu* of 81 squares (ekāśiti padavāstu), *padavāstu* of 100 squares (*śatapada vāstu*). All such units house the deities *pada-devatās* some time occupying only one unit (eka-padadevatā), some time one and half unit of squares (sārdhapadika) half squares (ardhapada) some time two squares (dvipada), some *devatās* occupy six squares (ṣaṭapada) and some nine squares (navapada). The basis of the three types of 'Vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala' is thus eight squares the either sides (8 x 8 = 64) or nine squares at either sides (9 x 9 = 81) or ten squares at either sides (10 x 10 = 100). In the first type Brahmā occupies in the central four squares (chatuṣpada) Brahmā and leaving the corner squares vaccant, situate at the four sides (mahyopāntastha) of Brahmā the *dvipada devatās*, namely Aryamā, Vivaśvāna, Mittra and Prithvīdhara, beginning from East and ending in the north, eight *ardhāpanika devatās* at each ceneral corners and eight other *devatās* at the outer squares. Other sixteen *devatās* are Parjañya, Bhṛśa, Pūṣan, Bhṛṅga, Dauvārika, Soṣa, Nāga, Aditi (all occupyiug one and half squares) and rest sixteen Jayanta etc. are *dvipada devatās*, thus totalling ultimately fortyfive *pada-devatās* and present the 'Vastupuruṣamaṇḍala' of 64 squares units. The names of all the *pada-devatās* are ennumerated in the texts, but can be sepplemented for information from 'Bṛhat Saṁhitā, 'Mayamataṃ' and 'Mānasāra'.

The second type of squares places Brahmā in the central nine squares as *navapadika devatā*. Then in the last occupying each six squares (ṣaṭa-padika devatās) in the east Aryamā in the south Vivśvān, in the west Mittra and in the north Pṛthvīdhara (Śeṣa). At the cordinal directions are *dvipada devatas*. Thus in the East-south (Āgneya Karṇa) are Sāvitṛ and Savitṛ in the South-west (Naiṛtya Karṇa) Jaya and Indra, in the West-north (vāyavya) Karṇa) Yakṣmā and Rudra and in the East-north (Īśāna Karṇa) Āpa and Āpavatsa *devatās*. The border outer squares are occupied by (begining from East and ending at North), Agni, Parjañya, Jayanta, Indra, Śūrya, Satya, Bhṛśa, Nabha, Anila. Pūṣan, Vitatha, Gṛhakṣata, Yama, Gandharva, Bhṛṅgarāja, Mṛga, Pitṛgaṇa, Dauvārika, Sugrīva, Puṣpadanta, Jaleśvara (Varuṇa), Asura, Soṣa, Pāpayakṣmā, Roga, Nāga, Mukhya. Bhallāṭa, Soma, Charaka, Aditi and Daityamātā (or Diti). All these thirty three are *eka pada devatās*.

The corner squares on the outer border which is occupied by Agni, Anila, Pitṛgaṇa and Roga are also shared by Charakī, Vidārī, Pāparākṣasī and Pūtanā. In the texts they are recognised as *pada-devatas* but their places are not specified.

The *śatapada vāstu* (building of 190 squares) specifies the place of Brahmā in the sixteen central square (*śodaśapadika Brahmā*). Then Aryamā (in the east), Vivaśvāna (in the south) Mittra (in the west) and Pṛthvīdhara (in the north) are aṣṭapadika devatās, adjoing Brahmā space. The border squares are occupied by the thirty *pada-devatās* of the second form of 81 units but with varying spaces. Thus Agni, Antarikṣa, Pavana, Mṛga, Kṣaya, Pitra, Roga and Aditi—these eight are *sārdha padika* and rest twenty four are one *padika devatas*.[6]

The concept of *pada-devatās* are not merely ritualistic but they govern and determine the entire composition of the ground plan aesthetically. Aesthetic proportions and symmetry is most scientifically derived by the fundamental concept of square. We have noted that all other aesthetic forms can be derived out of these squares. The extent buildings, particularly the temple according to this text can be either square or rectangular or circular or the combined shape of the two of the above forms. For this the 64 and 100 square units are suitable. Triangular, hexagonal, octogonal etc. are also can be achieved out this square concept. From any form of the ground plan, thus derived the elevation emerges like the sprout from the seed. The *aṅkuraṇā* ceremony at the various stages of the constructions symbolizes this fact. The ground plan, is the womb (garbha). The *garbhagṛha* (sanctum) is the nucleus of the temple architecture. From this the other members on the ground plan, such as *ardhamaṇḍapa*, *maṇḍapa* etc. are the rhythmic extension connected with *garbhagraha*. The concept of 'vāstupuruṣa' is in two fold, one from the point of view of ground plan and the other from the point of view of elevation. In ground plan the 'Vāstupuruṣa' is in the lying posture covering the whole space (squares) of the *vāstu maṇḍala*. In early concept of Bṛhat Saṁhitā' the head of the 'Puruṣa' lies in the north east, but in the later concepts it lies in the east (Samarāṇgaṇasūtradhāra). The face and head, two ears, two eyes, jaw, lips, teeth, breast, neck, nave, genetial organ, testicles, rectum (gudā), two arms, two *pravāhus*, two sphiks, two knees, two thighs two legs etc. occupy the whole space of the ground plan. The nerves, the joints, the sub joints etc. also cover the space. The effort and covering the whole ground-plan by gods etc. is under the concept that 'Vāstupuruṣa' or 'Vāstunara'—a demon, could be laid low by the gods. The rise of the demon is determental to the construction. But the elevation (utsedha) of the building and the temple or even the temple complex is aesthetically syncronised on the basis of these squares conceived by the architect for the ground plan. The elevational aspects have been variously determined in various texts dealing with the regional styles. But in every tradition of the '*Śilpa*' the fundamental square known as 'Brahmapada' or 'Brahmasthāna' remained the basis for the architects in calculating the relative proportion of the different parts of a building. Basing on the fundamental situation of 'Brahmsthāna' the positton of *āmalaka* is also to be determined. Over the 'abode of god' (devāyatana, devālaya) represents several symbolic and cosmic concepts, The finial point of *Kalaśa* and the central point of 'Brahmasthāna' is connected by the vertical line (Brahmasūtra), which symbolically represents the function of *mūlādhāra* on the vedic concept of 'Rodasi Brahmāṇḍa'. Just as in the *pratyakṣajagata*, *bhūmi*, *antarikṣa* and *dyuḥ* are the three *lokas*, so the three fundamental units of temple represent the three *lokas*. *Jagatī* or *adhisthāna* (padasthānīya) = pṛthvī, *garbhagṛha* or *mandovara* (madhyasthānīya = antarikṣa and *śikhara* (sīrs-sthānīya) = dyuḥ. They are further equated with *mana*, *prāṇa* and *vāk*.[10] The concept of trinity has also effected this symbolism. In one way the whole 'Śivālaya' is the symbol of 'Liṅga' hence the lower square portion of the temple (Jagatī or adhiṣṭhāna) is 'Brahmābhāga', the middle part, which is octogonal (garbhagṛha or mandovara) is Viṣṇubhāga and the upper, the top part, which is circular (śikhara) is Śivabhāga. Alternatively, *pīṭha* or *jagatī* represents 'Brahmāṇḍa', the *jaṅgha* may be equated with the *pañchabhūtas* (earth, air, water, fire and heaven). 'Kantha' is *māyā*, Amalasara is *vidyā*, kalaśa is *Īsvara*. In the *Tāntric* mysticism 'Kalaśa' and other crowning members represent certain *Tāntric* principles, such as *kalaśa* is *bindu*, *daṇḍa* is *nāda*, *śula* is *triśakti* and *dhvaja* is *kuṇḍalī-śakti*'. How the cosmic 'Puruṣa' is synchronised in the elevational aspect of a temple, is very well confirmed by the terms like (*khura*, *pada* or *pabhāga*, *jaṅgha* (tala-jaṅgha and Uparijaṅgha corresponding to leg and thigh), *grīvā* or *bekī* (neck), *khapurī* (head) etc. Analogy of human body or the .'Cosmic Puruṣa' is very significant idea of Indian *Vāstuśāstra* discussed through out its course of development and the idea was not limited to any time or space. These terms 'denote the anatomical position and function of the structural parts corresponding those of the human body, and are often used figuratively to emphasise the concept of organic unit in temple architecture.[11] Not only in external organism, but in the consideration of inner soul (prāṇa) of the 'Puruṣa' the analogy can be seen with perfection. Living use of a temple begins with the instalation of life in the form of the deity in the construction of temple, it does not remain as merely the 'abodem' of god but the 'god' himself. The temple is the body and the image in the sanctum is the soul of the 'Puruṣa' pulsating the whole cosmos. 'Mayamatam' (ch. XVIII) and 'Śilparatna' (ch. XVI. 114) clearly state that the *Prāsāda* should be worshipped as 'Puruṣa'. Its form is the monumental embodiment of the 'Puruṣa', the essence. It is the form of consciousness itself.[12]

The unity of body and soul and the organic unity of anatomical factors are relevant to bring the concept of aesthetic unity into the organism of a construction of a *prāsāda*, whether in the sense of a temple or a palace.

Over the fixed ground the mass of temple stands as a monument of radiance, with the buttresses and recesses and their sculptural exposition suggesting an unbroken rhythmic form. All members constitue the aesthetic unit of the architecture characteristed by perfection of form, accuracy of proportions determine by the *śāstramānas*, and representing the wonderful world through the sculptural depictions in diverse shapes of all creatures, high and low, encaged in their bodies through their various actions.[13]

Certain representative '*Silpa*' texts, such as 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra 'Rājavallabha', 'Prāsādamaṇḍana', 'Aparājitapṛcchā', 'Śilparatna' etc. determine variety of shapes and sizes of temple-architecture considering its relationship with the fundamental squares (within the ground-plan, consisting of 64, 81, 100 squares *padas*). Since the various members of the elevational aspect of the temple also determined the regional styles, we can note some representative examples only of the elevational plan and its proportions based on primary squares as *pada-devatās*. Either the foot (khura or pada) of the temple stands just over the ground level or over the *jagatī* or *adhiṣṭhāna*, which itself is either higher or low (from 1 to 12 *hastas*); square or star shaped. 'Prāsādamaṇḍana' indicates while the *jagatī* itself may assume *koṇas* on the squares, conceived in terms of *pada-devatās*; numbering from four to thirty-six (ch. II. 8), the main possible form achieved in Indian architecture are five—suqare (chaturasra), rectangular (āyata), octogonal (aṣṭasra), circular (vṛtta), and apsidal (vṛttāyata) (ch. II, 2). The relationship of *jagatī* and *prāsāda* must be determined by the prescribed ratio which should be thrice, four or five times higher than the *jagatī* the basic squares (padas) are significant in fixing the typology of *sandhāra* and *nirandhāra* type of temples. The intricate arrangement of *thāras* are intersect by pillasters, *tavaṅgas*, *praṇālikas*, *rathikas*, bold deleneations of human and animal figures and of floating decorative panels *sajjāpaṭṭis* etc. The ratio of different decorative bands of the *jagatī* as indicated in the 'Prāsāda Maṇḍana' also follow the system of square *padas* at the elevational aspect consisting of twenty-eight units called also the *padas* (taduchhrāyaṁ bhajet prājñaḥ tu aṣṭaviṁśatibhiḥ padaiḥ).[14] Thus three *padas* represent the *jāḍyakumbhas*, two *kaṇikās*, three *padmapatras* and *grāsapaṭṭi*, two *khurās*, seven *kumbhas*, three *kalaśa*, one *antarapatra*, three *kapotalī*, four *puṣpakanthas*. The textual indications favour the instalation of *dikpāla* images at the four corners of the *jagatī*. Such as in the elevation (utsedha of uchhrāya). Similarly the conceive square *padas* play a very significant role in determining the sizes and situations of *rathas*, *anurathas*, *koṇarathas*, *pratirathas*, representing *triratha*, *pañcharatha*, *saptaratha* and *navaratha* temple plan, *sandhis* —joints of different members of elevational walls, called *bhadra*, *koṇa*, *pratibhadra*, *bhadrāṁśa*, *salilāntara* etc. (Aparājitapṛcchā. 115. 23–26, Prāsādamaṇḍana II. 11).

When once the proportions of *jagatī* in relation to the *padas* on the ground plan is determined, the difficulty in visualizing the total aspects of elevation of temple is minimised. *Prāsādapīṭha* is a seperate member of a temple over the *jagatī*. A ratio is determined betwen the floor of *garbhagṛha* and *prāsāda pīṭha*. The scheme of *thara* panels are indicated in the 'Prāsāda Maṇḍana' and Aparājitapṛcchā as follows :—

'Nine units (padas) for *jāḍyakumbha*, seven for *Kaṇis*, *kapotalī*, seven *grāsapaṭṭī* (panel depicting a row of lion faces), and over that twelve *padas* for *gajathara* (row of elephants), ten *padas* for *aśvathara* (row of horses), eight *padas* for *narathara* (depicting processional themes or scenes of human beings) each interviened by a narrow decorative strips (karṇikas)[15]. The actual elevational aspect (udaya) of the temple over *jagatī* or *prāsāda-maṇḍovara*, which in the sequence of *jagatī* and the ground plan is divided into 144 parts from the topmost part of *prāsāda pīṭha* to the *kūṭa-chhāddya* distributed horizontally as follows :—

5 parts *Khuraka*, 20 parts *kumbhaka*, 8 parts *kalaśa*, 2½ parts *antarāla* (intervening space or *sajjāpaṭṭi* between *kalaśa* and *kapotikā*), 8 parts *kapotikā*, 9 parts *mañchī*, 35 parts *jaṅgha*, 15 parts *urujaṅgha*, 8 parts *bharaṇī*, 10 parts *śīrāvaṭī* or *śirāpaṭṭa*, then again 8 parts *kapotikās* and 2½ parts for the second *antarāla* over which is *chhāddya* (roofing) consisting of 13 parts. This standard ratio of different parts of *udaya* of a *maṇḍovara* is actually found in practice at Rajasthan and Gujarat though with certain variations, according to needs and decorative situations are also noticed. The *jaṅgha*, the *mañcha* and all other parts of the *udaya* of *maṇḍovara*, provide the aesthetic situations for artistic creations in the form of sculptural and decorative arrangement[16]. The 'Aparājitapṛcchā' (ch. 122) and 'Dīpārṇava (ch. V) particullarly give emphasis on the beautification of this part of *maṇḍovara* as the use of rendering images at the specified places, at the decorative architectural members such as *khuraka*, *kumbhaka*, *nāsikā*, *rathikā*, *stambhikā* (pillasters), *toraṇa*, *kapotalī*, *mañchikā*, etc. The figure-sculptures, such as of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and their,[17] *parikaras*, *parivāradevatās*, *apasaras* (dancing damsels), animals as *Vāhanas* or (appearing in the processional themes) and foliages etc. (mṛṇālapatra) also should deck the *maṇḍovara* etc. On the *Jaṅgha* the specific situations are given as the *dikpālas* on the *karṇas*, Nateśa on the western side (bhadra), Andhakeśvara on the South side, Chaṅdikā at the North. At the *pratirathas* eight consorts a *dikpālas* and at the *vārimārga* the *ṛṣis*. shonld be shown.[18] Sometimes the number of units and ratio among different members also vary, such as in the case of 'Meru Maṇḍovara' which has more horizontal bands and the *tharas* than the other forms of *maṇḍovaras* and consist instead 144 parts or units from *khuraka*

to *chhāddya*. Sometimes it is reduced to 27 only. The texts also determine the ratio and proportions of the members of pillars and pillasters and invariably the emphasis is given in all texts on the strict relationship of door (dvāra) and wall (bhitti) and the concept of *rathas* determine the formation of *dvāraśākhās*, *udumbara*, *uttaraṅga*, *lolaṭabimbas* etc. All these members are noted for the aesthetic situations, which are invariably decked with the figures of *kumbhikas*, *patra*, *saṅkha*, *padma*, *mālādhara*, *kīrtimukha*, *gajalakṣmī* and other auspicious and decorative symbols and floral foliges etc. The *dvāraśākhas*—three to nine, follow the arrangement and sequence of *ratha*, three to nine and are named as 'Padminī' (nine śākhās), 'Hastinī' (seven śākhās), Nandinī' (five śākhās), 'Mukulī' (eight śākhās), Mālinī (six śākhās), 'Gandhārī' (four śākhās), 'Subhaga' (three śākhās). Below this *dviśakhā* doors and *ekaśākhā* doors are also mentioned and called *Suprabha* and *Smarakīrti*. They were commonly used for the doors in the domestic houses (Aparājatapṛcchā, 131).

Over the roof (chhāddya) of the sanctum (garbhagṛha) the elevated (udaya) *śikhara* is aesthetically embelished with the rows of *uruśṛṅgas* and *sukanāsa* over the *bhadra* (side) of the *prāsāda-śikhara*. Below *chhāddya* the scheme of *sandhāra* and *pradakṣiṇāpatha* also provide the aesthetic elements to a temple. They are functional as well as decorative and induce the element of light and shade (kṣayavṛdhi) not only in the sculptural arrangment, but in the architectural members also. The unique feature is the arrangement of *uruśṛṅgs*, which is commonly in the ratio 7:13, whereas the ratio of the *bhadra* side of *śikhara* from bottom to top, upto *skandha* is 10:6. The concept of *mūlarekhā* and *kalā rekhā* and their determination as well as distencing is very significant in specifying the nature of '*śikhara* in 'Nāgara' temple style. On the basis of central *mūlarekhā* the either sides total 256 *kalārekhās* are to be determined to achieve the desired shape of the *śikhara*. Instead going into the details, which is extensively discussed, particularly in the 'Apārajitapṛcchā' (ch. 138-144) and also about the process of creating *karṇas*, *andakas* etc. the simple formula, conditioning the breadth of the *chhāddya* and elevation (udaya) of the '*śikhara*' is indicated in the 'Prāsādamaṇḍans' as follows:—From *Khara-śilā* (śilātaḥ) to the finial (kalaśāntaḥ) there should be twenty divisions (viṁśadibhirbibhajedbhagaiḥ ch. IV. 22). The ratio between the *maṇḍovara* and *śikhara* should be of 8:12. The vertical space intervening the *skandha* and the finial of *padmakośa* is fixed at the ratio well determined by the *śilpa* texts as it is the most aesthetic aspect of a temple. These should be seven total proportionate division (1 *grīvā*) + 1½ *amalasara* + 1½ *padmachhattra* or *chandrikā* + 3 *kalaśa*). The circumference (aṇḍa) of *kalaśa* should be in 1:8 ratio of the ground plan of the *prāsāda*, (ch. IV. 24-25).

On the above mentioned principles of architecture the associated buildings such as 'Jagamohona' 'bhogamaṇḍapa' naṭamaṇḍapa' (in the case of Orissan temple); 'kaulī or antarāla' gūḍhamaṇḍapa 'chatuṣkikā, at the sides, 'Tṛkamaṇḍapa', 'Raṅgamaṇḍapa' and 'Śṛṅgāra platform in the Gurjar-meru class of temple; 'Antarāla', various types of 'Maṇḍapas' 'Ardhamaṇḍapa' also 'Makara Toraṇa' (in Kandavīya Mahādeva') are also made on the axis of the sanctum (garbhagṛha) of the temple. In the *Draviḍian* temples the constructional scheme vary with *Nāgara* and the other types of temples, but in suggesting the aesthetic situation in the temple architecture underlying principles do not differ with each other. The texts, whether of North. Indian tradition or of South, refer to various decorative elements mostly taken from the world of Nature and the animal kingdom and also from the world of mythology. The texts do prescribe the depiction of schemes from mythology, fables, and other walks of worldly life to produce a delightful atmosphere over the *bhadra* (sides) of temple, not only to achieve religious end but the aesthetic purpose and joy also. *Alaṁkāra* and *Rasa* play an important part in Indian architecture. Different schemes and themes and ethier sculptural rendering on the temple walls and other parts, do create the situation for aesthetic joy and hence certain themes which are not suitable to the creation of such desired joy are prohibited for the portrayal. The usual motifs and figures on temple walls and other architectonic situations are, *makara, mithuna, śālabhañjikā, gajavyālas, apsaras, śālā, kūṭa, hāra, kudus etc.*

So far we have considered the aesthetic situations and symbolic relationship of different parts of architecture as well as the infinite possibilities of the concept of squares on the ground plan, as *pada-devatās* having power to determine the whole aspects of a *vāstu* and with special reference to a *prāsāda*. We have also referred to both the concepts; that a temple architecture is not only the abode of 'God' but the 'God himself,. As such, one can see a difference in the nature and the concept of architecture between India and the 'West' where the architecture is not only 'an external art' but also an 'external entity of Divine'. According to Hegel the architecture aims at working external inorganic nature into such form that it may get related to mind as artistic objective world. Its material is inorganic matter as mechanical inert mass. Its form is the form of the inorganic nature, but arranged in accordance with the intellectual relation of symmetry. It is called external art because its products stand only in an external relation to the spiritual idea. They do not embody it. It struggles with the external nature, in order to work it out or deformity of accident and thus to prepare the place for the Divinity. It builds temples for inner aspiration and concentration upon the Divinity and thus manifests the tendency to self-concentration in worship. It organises the inorganic matter, arranges its symmetrically and brings it into relation with spirit. And just because the products of architecture stands in external relation to the Divine it is symbolic.[19]

In our traditional concept, the *vāstu* or the *prāsāda* of the god has more intimate relationship with Divine than what we see in the West and its symbolism and ritualistic considerations are not externally derived but is inherent in the every element of the *vāstu*. The formal relationship and the internal characteristics dependent on certain cogent underlying principles, which in great detail are discussed in several representative *śilpa* texts. Such principles may be summerised here as follows. Such principles lead not merely to the formal relationship but also to the inner vision of the *vāstu*. Some of these principles are the fundamentals of architecture in the Western concepts also, to which we will initiate briefly.

Our ancients with a view to achieve the aesthetic end spontaneously, gave emphasis on the natural surrounding of the *vāstu*, hence selection of site and soil was given preference. The quality of soil and the size and suitability of soil and site depended upon the adequate mesures of testing and examination of soil and site (bhūparikṣā). This was a significant aspect to achieve the quality of solidity and stability of a building. The examination of soil was based on the colour, taste, smell, elevation, sound, touch, overgrowth of trees and shurbs, the quality of water etc. The determination of cordinal direction (dikṣādhana), astronomical and other considerations regarding *āya* and *vyaya* was considered very important. The various texts give emphasis on the determination of the direction of house and other types of building and also the determination of the situation of doors etc. Regarding this it is clearly indicated that all buildings must face exactly the cordinal points and not the intermediate spaces' (dikṣu sadaiva kartavyaḥ na vidikṣu kadāchana). The auspicious time in terms of *lagna, nakṣatra, graha, māsa, saṁkrānti, vats* etc. was also carefully decided (Prāsāda-Maṇḍana I. 11-12). The shape of building was also determined according to the certain auspicious diagrams, such as 'svastika', 'sarvatobhadra', 'Nandyāvarta' etc., which has great significance and symbolic meaning, but more significance was attached to the ground plan and its consideration in relation to *vastupada vibhāga.*

Without any exception the *'Śilpa'* texts give details of the units of measurement for the determination of height, width and depth of different structures. Such units of measures are universally approved by all texts and are applicable not only to architecture, but in case of plastic arts also, such as sculpture and painting. For all practical purposes the *aṅgula* is admitted as the basic unit of all measurements, higher being the *vitasti, hasta* and *daṇḍa.* There is no applicability in architecture or sculpture, the lower units than the *aṅgula* which are universally described in the *śilpa* texts such as *reṇu, balāgra, likṣā.* The width of *aṅgula* is also difficult to determine due to diversity of views. Most probably the unit of *aṅgula* (one aṅgula = 8 yavamadhya) was fixed in case of architecture, but not in case of plastic arts. This type of *aṅgula* was *mānāṅgula.* But *aṅgula* as the undetermined unit of measurement was based on two standards. The former standard is described in the 'Arthaśāstra' as the middle portion of the middle finger of a medium man (madhyamasya puruṣasya madhyamāyā aṅgulamadhyaprakarṣovāṅgula II. 20, 6-8). The same definition continues from the 'Bṛhatsaṁhitā (57. 4) to 'Śukranīti (IV. 40). Again the standard of *aṅgula* is also sometime taken either as to be the *aṅgula* (i. e. the width of the finger) of the master (svakīyāṅgulimānena, Matsya. 257. 19) or sometimes that of the massion (sthapati, Agni Purāṇa in 44). All above systems of the determination of *aṅgula* as a definite unit (1) *aṣṭayavamadhya* (2) *svakīyāṅgala* or the *aṅgula* of *yajamāna* and (3) the *aṅgula* of *sthapati* are not the practical units to be used in the plastic arts. The determination of *aṅgula* on the basis of ratio (mātrā) was applicable to the art of painting and sculpture. The artist (sculpture and painter) normally fixed the height of the figure itself according to the canvas or the medium, then determined the length of face as the ninth part of the total hight of the body. Thus the artist first determined the *tāla* of the *mukha* and then fixed the size of the image. (pratimāmukhamānena navabhāgān prakalpayet, Matsya Purāṇa, 257, 26). The twelth part of proportionately determined face was considered as equal to one *aṅgula* (aṅgulapramāṇairdvādasa vistīrṇamāyataṁ ch mukhaṁ, Agni Purāṇa. 44. 2). The consideration of *tālāmāna*[20] in relation to image are very significant, about and discussed in work of the texts.

The various *vāstusūtras* lay down fixed rules regulating the size of the various kinds of structures and the relative proportion of the size of different parts of a structure. The structure as a whole or the different members too are generally classified into three classes—*uttama* (highest),*madhyama* (middle) and the *adhama* (lowest) and into various *jātis*, usually fourteen, based on various principles such as size, form, decorative elements, materials, mouldings etc and also their nomenclature being based on geographical, mythological and even poetic. The classification system is broad based and includes doors, gateways, pillars, *talas*, *vimānas*, *maṇḍapas* etc. The prominent consideration for the classifications (jāti) of *prāsāda*, either eight (prāsādamaṇḍana I. 7-8) or fourteen (Aparājitapṛcchā. 112) as a matter of fact is based on region (prāsādānāṁ cha sanivesāṁ jātayo deśabheda taḥ, Prāsādmaṇḍana. I 9). The main *jātis* are 'Nāgara', 'Draviḍa', 'Bhūmija', 'Latin', 'Sandhāra', 'Vimāna-nāgara', Vimāna-puṣpaka', 'Śṛṅga' 'Tilaka', and 'Miśraka' (Prāsādamaṇḍana I. 7-8). At first instance, though 'Aparājitapṛcchā' gives the list of eight *jātis* of temple known also from 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' but further it provides the list of temple-types ennumerating Nāgara, Draviḍa, Latina, Vesara, Vimāna, Sandhāra, Vimāna-nāgara, Miśraka, Bhūmija, Vimāna-Puṣpaka, Valabhī, Siṁhāvalokana, Dāruja and Napuṁśaka. In relation to god and worship 'Aparājitapṛcchā' presents a list of fourteen types of *prāsādas*. Thus, 'Nāgara', for *devas*, 'Draviḍa' for *dānavas*, 'Latina' for *Gandharvas*', 'Vimāṇajātis' for *Yakṣas*, 'Miśraka' for *Vidyādharas*, 'Varāṭaka' for *Vasus*, Sandhāra for *Nāgas*, Vimāna-puṣpaka' for 'Chandramā', 'Valabhī for Pārvatī, 'Siṁhāvalochana' for Harasiddhi, Noose shaped (Phāsāṇakāra) for *Vyantara devatās* and '*Rathas*' for the gods origined from the Indraloka. (Aprājitapṛcchā. 106).

Some of the above list are difficult to determine. *Nāgara* variety itself is classified into several varieties and sub-varieties. Thus ch. 66 mentions 'Meru', 'Mandara', 'Kailāśa', 'Vimānacchanda', 'Nandivardhana', 'Nandana', 'Sarvatobhadra', 'Uṛṣa', 'Siṁha', 'Gaja', 'Kumbha', 'Samudra', then again 'Padmaka', 'Garuḍa', 'Haṁsa', 'Vartula', 'Chaturasra', 'Aṣṭāsra', 'Ṣodāsra', 'Mṛgarāja', 'Valabhīcchanda' and Śṛvṛkṣa, ch. 60 of 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' gives the thirty-six varieties, under the catagories—'Śrīkūṭādi', twenty-seven varieties under 'Vairāja' (square) group, fourteen varieties under 'Puṣpaka' group, eleven varieties under 'Kailāśa' group (the other texts refer to its sixteen varieties) ten group of Māṇika (oval) variety and ten varieties of 'Tṛviṣṭapa' group (octogonal).[21]

While the early Draviḍian texts, though refer to 137 names of temple-types, but could not make distinction between the northern and the southern traditions, but the later Draviḍian texts such as 'Śilparatna', Mayamataṁ, Kāśyapīya', 'Mānasāra' refer to various types of temples to be distinguished on the basis of their *talas* or *bhūmis*. Śilparatna' refers to 'Śrībhoga' (one storyed), 'Svastika' (2 and 3 storyed) 'Samudra' (4 storeyed), 'Brahmakānta' (5 storeyed) 'Ambujasthāna' (6 storeyed), 'Śricchanda' (7 storeyed), 'Śivacchanda' (8 storeyed), and 'Vijaya' (9 storeyed). 'Mayamataṁ' and 'Kāśyapīya' also ennumerate these varieties and their sub-varieties, thus totalling round about 114 varieties of *Draviḍajātīya prāsādas*. The 'Mayamataṁ', however superseeds all the lists of the southern tradition and refers to multistoreyed *prāsādas* from 10 to 12 and also giving their sub-varieties numbering twenty two. It is also to be noted that in the southern tradition there is indication of the temple having 13 to 15 storeyed But their details and names are not known. In one list, however, there is reference to 16 storeyed temple with its 6 sub-varsieties.

The 'Vairāṭī' and 'Kaliṅga' group are also known from various medieval texts. 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' refers to 12 varieties of 'Vairāṭī' temples and under its sub-classification such as 'Mahāmeru', 'Bhadra' and 'Khakharā' 67 sub-varieties of temples are mentioned in the Orissan *Silpa* texts.

'Aparājitapṛcchā' (ch, 112) referring to various varieties of temples also specifies the region to which the type is related. Thus in the Gaṅgā valley (Gaṅgā tīreṣu) the traditional eight varieties (aṣṭānveye) of 'Nāgara' temple are ascribed. 'Sandhāra' temples are referred to have located in the 'Ahirāja (Ābhīradeśa = Pañchāla) and also in Gauḍa, Vaṅga and Kāmarūpa. Below the Gaṅgā region various 'Vimāna' type of temples also popularly flourished. Since the portion of the text dealing the topic, is not complete, hence the types referred as belonging to the Choladeśa, Mahānīla region, Mālya region, Kaliṅga and Karnāṭa as well as Kānyakubja, Koṅkaṇa also had their own styles as *jātis* of the temples. In the Vairājyadeśa (?) Virāṭa type of temple was favoured and it was also common in Koṅkaṇa and Dakṣiṇāpatha. Similarly there is reference to the temple *jātis* of Mālavā, Kāñchī, Kālinga, Antaravedī Magadha, Mathurā, Himāśraya, Daṇḍkāraṇya, Satya, Sindhu, Khurāṣāṇa (Khurasan), Saurāṣṭra, Gurjjara, Kaśmīra etc. The stylistic types—'Vyantara', 'Kaliṅga' and 'Yāmuna' 'Vesara', however, find less mention. 'Vāsturāja' of Maṇḍana, though refers, 'Vesara' does not give the details and same is the case with 'Śilparatna'. But in the inscriptional records it occurs from about the 9th century A. D. (Hototal inscription refrring the architect Bammoja as the author of this style), along with four others-*Nāgara*, *Kaliṅga* and *Draviḍa*.

The various *Śilpa* texts also mention several types of *maṇḍapas*, *adhiṣṭhānas*, *upapīṭhas*, *stambhas*, *gopuram* etc.[22]

Not only for the sake of stability, but also for the grace and beauty the attention of texts was very much concentrated on the selection of the best material for construction. The material involved an adequate amount of technique and also certain ceremonials to be followed before and along the use as the every bit of the architectural work was considered as *anuṣṭhāna*. Since the whole act of construction itself was a ritual, strict rules for the *māna* and the proportions were to be followed. The texts without fail warn about the demerits, one has to undergo if the building is not only technically wrong, due to *hīna* or *adhikamāna* etc. but also because of faulty material used (niṣedhavāstūdravya) etc. Six types of vāstu *doṣas* are ennumerated in the 'Prāsādamaṇḍana'. They are over-plastering (bahulepa), under plastering (alpalepa) disjoint (asamasandhi), unprotionate members (śiroguru), breakage (saśalya) and defective foundation (padahīna).[23] The technical defects together with unproper situation of the building (diṅgamūḍha) and also the decay condition of a *vāstu* (if used) is harmful. The concept of *mahādoṣas* are significant in relation to old buildings (VIII. 16) and *doṣas* characterised by faulty situation and wrong fixation of cardinal positons (diṅgmūḍha), unrhythmic and disbalanced (uṣtachhanda), disregard of astronomical considerations (āyahīnaḥ) and disproportion (śiroguruḥ) are the real and avoidable defect of a newly constructed *vāstu* (Aparājitapṛcchāch, 110).

'Prāsādamaṇḍana' (ch. VIII. 20-28). adds a list of other architectural defect mentioning their respective demerits. Some of such defects are unsized doors, defective channel for water course, situation of pillars not at proper places, defective pillars due to over or under breadth or height, unsuitable plinth, or the plinth with defective corners, over or under size of *jagatī*, *jaṅgha*, *śikhara* and also the obstruction of light and shade etc.

The removal of such physical defects leads to aesthetic sublimity. The above account without doubt indicate the complexity of Indian temple architecture. Not only the each *jāti* or regional styles, but even the members within the *jātis* had their separate identity, but taken together as the total membes within a *jāti* make a whole style, so the individual styles and *jātis* ultimately present an indivisible entity in the form of common denomination of Indian architecture.

Humanist like Geoffery Scott[24] considered the architecture under three conditions : commodity, firmness and delight. Apparently they look to be the three entities and isolated in purposes, they are blended in a single method; they are fulfilled in a single result; yet in their own nature they are distinguished froms each other by a deep and permanent dispariety. The above is the view of the western critics, which appears almost the result of a confused investigation. Not only in the result but even in purpose as well as in the form of organic entity the architecture (Indian) is an absolute entity. Commodity, which is the *vāstu* in the external manifestation is inherent with the qualities of 'firmness' and 'delight', By fulfilling these two conditions only a *vāstu* can be accepted as an entity of art, otherwise it may remain a matter of 'physical fact' of the 'fact of utility'.

Our *Śilpa* texts provide the material data and explain the material laws explaning the thrust and balance, pressure and support determine the shape and size and also the character of material which mould the form, and govern even the decorative details. The subject matter of architecture is not discussed by our ancients in an isolated or segamented way but in relation to science of building, the art of building and ultimately in relation to life. The aesthetic value of the ancient architecture therefore should be judged on various planes-such as its constructive skill, the standards of rhythm and proportion and ultimately the standard of practical use together with the moral impulse of the architect and the builder. But the impulse of 'reason' and 'logic' which is almost the fundamental of the technique of building, is not the contradictory to the sense of aesthetic pleasure. The theory of architecture tough requires logic, but it requires none the less, an independent sense of beauty. For this reason, interwoven with practical ends and their mechanical solutions, beauty comes as a significant factor of Indiam architecture, culminating in a purely aesthetic result. This feature of architecture is unique and singular. It is only this form of art in which a purely aesthetic impulse is simultaneously satisfied alongwith quite a distinct and almost a contrary impulse of utilitarianism. It becomes sometimes by way of suggestion and sometime direct for the reason that the element of delight as well as the aesthetic impulse is itself inherent in the Indian concept of architecture, particularly when the utility itself is judged under the concept of religious sensibility.

On purely aesthetic considerations, architecture in India as elsewhere, has rightly been perceived as a combination of light and shade, spaces, mass, lines, balance and rhythm. All these elements not merely the 'appearance' but are also the 'beauty'–the source of delight. The relationship of building with human body and human mood is often determined in the western thought under the principle that 'we transcribe architecture into terms of ourselves'. This is the humanism of architecture which has been greatly pleaded by Geoffery Scott.[25] He has pleaded that the tendency to project the image of our functions into concrete froms is the basis for architecture, of creative design'. This feeling itself is the result of self consciousness as it is evident in the European architecture (Renaissance period), where the human being in figure appearing as colums in columnar forms. It is true, that the habit of projecting the image of our own function upon the outside world, of reading the outside world in our own terms, is certainly more favourably perceived by our '*Śilpāvidās*', in form of nameing the members of a *prāsāda* on the names of the human organs such as *pada*, *jaṅgha*, *uru*, *grīvā*, *mastaka* etc. Besides the attempt of inner symbolic relationship of a *vāstu* with 'Puruṣa' it refers to the attempt of humanization of the external appearance of the *vāstu*. But while this concept of organism of Indian *vāstu* is either in suggestion or in its symbolic relationship, in western architecture the design itself is often based on the human body. Such features can be noticed in the Renaissance architecture and also in the Tuscan, Ionic and Corinthian orders.[26] Such examples do not occur in the Indian architecture. But in the designs of pillars the animals significantly play a role, eg. the *vyāla* pillars of the Pallavas of Rāja siniha style and the pillars rendered in the shape af galloping horses with the rider (Sriraṅgam Temple Shasramaṇḍapa, 16th-17th century A. D.) The Western theorists determine the elements of humanism of architecture on their analysis of space, mass, line, and coherence. But in the Indian concept these elements are judged as the indiuidual entity at the technical levels and their total results on the aesthetic levels. Of all these factors line is considered as the supreme factor affecting our sense of delight. The significance of line *rekhā* was so realised that the tower of the temple of *Nāgara* style itself was designted as '*rekhā-deul*' in Orissan tradition. Line suggest the spece and conveys the rhythmic movement. It controls the mass and brings all members into our coherent entity. Lines and rhythmic movement generate a sort of sensation which through various pleasing experiences leads to delight.

Supremacy of spatial value in Indian architecture has been equally realized for, the architecture alone of all arts can give space its full value. It can surround us with a void of three dimension; and whatever delight may we derived from, that is the gift of architecture alone. Painting can depict space; poetry can recall its image, music can give us its analogy, but architecture deals with space directly; it uses space as a material and sets us in the midst'.[27]

From the utilitarian point of view space is the logical end of architecture. and to enclose the space is the primary end of a building. Space in Indian architecture is specified by *jagati, adhiṣthāna* or *prāchīra* etc. A symmetrical space, dully proportioned invites movement of optical vision and provides equipoise and controls to our consciousness. The concept of space not only provides the opportunity and power to architect for imagination, but also gives the aesthetic illusion of various kinds to the spectators. Though fixed in proportions and actual dimensions, under the concept of space an architecture is affected by lighting and the position of shadows; it is affected by colour; a dark sanctum and lighted roof, it is affected by our own expectancey, it is affected by the character of the predominating lines; an emphasis on the verticals, gives an illusion of greater height (as an example, may be noted the Kandaria Mahadeo; when seen from the ground to 'Kalaśa', the height to the temple appears much more than actual) and an emphasis on horizontals gives the sense of greater breadth (as to be seen in the vertical *pida* system of *Vimāna* of the Dravidian style). The horizontal bands of various *bhumis*, particularly with the arrangement of *kuḍus* and *chaitya gavākśas* of the *sikhara* of Dravidian *Vimāna* gives the impression of lesser height than what the actual height is, for example the Bṛhadīśvara temple of Tanjore, The spatial value resulting from projections, depressions (such as in the sequence of *rathas, anurathas, salilāntaras* etc.) symmetrical spire and dome in the *garbhagṛha* and *maṇḍapa*, at the depth of transcepts (such as at Khajuraho temples), have been significantly realised and determined by our ancient architects in their plans and elevations of the temple architecture as we gleam from the tradition of the *Silpa* texts.

Space is the necessary medium of movement, the solids are essential for support, pressure and resistance and convey the aesthetics feeling of dignity, mass and largeness. Space and solides are interdependent and contribute not only to the physical firmness and security (for this as observed above the Indian architects carefully avoid the defects of material and the technique of construction) but also to contour and composition of decorative elements and figural scheme, which though undefacted with the solidity of the mass actually appear with their own aesthetic identity and entity.

In our traditional texts the principles of sculpture have been assimilated to those of architecture and painting. But the early history of Indian art presents sculpture as in the independent status both under two and three dimensional concepts. The free standing Mauryan pillars are represented as three-dimensional objects. The pre-Kusana *yakṣas* are as if assumiug the three dimensional nature, though frontality is the chief characteristis of these figures. Śuṅga art is the negation of three dimensional concept, but with the advant of Kusana art the three dimensional character of the sculptural art regains its conformation. Under the classical forms the three-dimensional feature is approved for the cult-images, though for *parivāra devatās* or for other *prāsāda-devatās* on the temple walls and doors etc. This characteristics is either technically in degrees or presented in the form of optic illusion. The same situation continued in the later periods also. The architectonic character of temple-sculptures is also a remarkable feature, particularly at the cave-temples and sometime the sculptures play the double role—one as the functional member of a temple (such as *gaṇaka* figures or the figures of *Bhāraputrās*, and sometimes they occure by the existance of their own, such as *mithunas*, *vidyādharas dvārapālas* etc. The optic illusion for the third dimension is produced by technically achieved depth in high or low reliefs in the light and shade (kṣyavṛddhi), which has been considerably disscussed by the 'Silpavidas' in the theory of painting. This brings the art of sculpture neares to the art of painting. In the Indian view, as reflected in the *Śilpa* texts the question of supremacy of sculpture or painting is not empthatically discussed as in the case of the western art-history where though for the Greeks the sculpture art was supreme art for its highest talent in the artist and the subtleast sensibiiity in the spectator; in the Renaissance art it was depreciated and highest place was given to painting. Leonardo who practiced both arts, stated bluntly that sculpture is 'less intellectual' than painting. The reason indicated for this opinion is that sculpture in aim presented identical result. From this point of view the effect of canons on Indian art too can be criticised. The set iconographic formulas appear to have produced the similar clumsy results. Certain texts even considered the 'śāstramāna' as the exclusive basis for the consideration of beauty (ramyatā) in sculptural art. But this identical situation of 'set formula and idenctical result' is not similar in historical sense. While the decay of sculptural art in western world can be attributed to its architectonic considerations, in India the consideration of religious sensibility and cult-devotion always remained a vital force to preseve the sculptural art as an independent entity; the element of 'śobhā' being the primary concern of the sculptures along with *māna*. Both had no contradiction in them, rather helped each other in visulization the 'form' and 'essence' of a perfect sculpture. 'Śāstramāna' or 'Mūrtilakṣaṇa' was not a 'taboo' on Indian sculpture but they worked as 'guides' for coherence and universal realization of true beauty. 'Form in the context of realization of divine erergy is presented in the form of sculpture. What Herbert Reed had pleaded in case of Rodin whose sculpture has affected the indepence of 'sculpture' from the other arts on the basis of its 'solid shapes with their inherent values of bulk, volume and ponderability' can be made the basis for the judgemet of independence of Indian sculpture too.

References

1. *Prāsādamaṇḍana*' and '*Aparajitapṛcchā*' discussess and describe 'Jinālaya' as exceptions. But in actual formation of the 'Jinālaya' they do not differ much with the general nature of 'Prāsāda'.
2. Supra., p. 35
3. Alice Boner, *Principles of Composition in Hindu Sculpture*, p. 241.
4. *Canons of Indian Art*, p. 190.
5. Stella Kramrich, *Hindu Temples*, Vol. I, p. 21.
6. Ibid., Vol. I. p. 22
7. Ibid., Vol. I. p. 22
8. Ibid, Vol., I. p. 29
9. *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*. ch. 11, 1–31;.
10. V. S. Agrawala in '*Prāsādamaṇḍana*, p. 17.
11. Krishna Deva, *North Indian Temples*, p. 1
12. *Hindu Temples*, Vol. II, p. 360.
13. Ibid. Vol. II. p. 90. Sirpur Inscription. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XI, p. 190.
14. *Prāsādamaṇḍana*, II. 11; '*Aparājitapṛcchā*', ch. 115. 23–26.
15. Prāsādamaṇḍana, III. 7–11
16. Ibid., III. 22–23.
17. The mentions *Chitraparikaraivṛfam*. Here *Chitra* is clearly used for the images. *Aparājitapṛcchā*, ch. 127. 8.
18. Ibid. 127. 23–25. For the situations of other gods and goddesses at door. see ch. 137. 7–22.
19. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II. pp. 417–418.
20. For the relevant discussion on the *aṅgulamāna*, see my *Rūpamaṇḍana*, pp. 22–26
21. *Canons of Indian Art*, pp. 445–446, 448.
22. Ibid. pp. 470–477.
23. *Prāsādamaṇḍana*, VIII. 3.
24. Geoffery Scott, *The Architecture of Humanism*, Pt. I. ch. 8.
25. *Problems of Aesthetics*, (2nd Ed.) p. 601.
26. Ibid., p. 605
27. Ibid., p. 608.
28. Herbert Read. *The Philosophy of Modern Art*, pp. 195–207.

VI

Theories of Painting

The painting, in one aspect or the other, is noticed in the Indian literature profoundly. But the theories and technique of painting is comprehensively discussed in the 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Nagnajit, 'Chitrasūtra' of 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa', 'Aparājitapṛcchā,' 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra', 'Abhilasitārthachintāmaṇi' (Mānasollāsa), 'Chitralakṣaṇa' in 'Śilparatna' of Śrikumāra. We propose here to discuss the theory of painting on the basis of such representative texts, in brief.

Traditionally 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Nagnajit is one of the earliest texts. But the original Sanskrit text is lost; it is found only in the Tibbetan Tañjūr of the medieval period. In the present state of affair this 'Chitralakṣaṇa' can not be dated with any amount of certainity, but as Nagnajit, to whom this text is ascribed is mentioned in the 'Bṛhat-Saṁhitā', it is quite probable that the text was known in the early Gupta period.[1]

The fragmentary nature of the text opens a discussion whether it was exclusively devoted to painting, or it was seperate to 'Pratimālakṣaṇa'. The 'Chitrasūtra' or other 'Chitralakṣaṇas' deal specifically the painting, though for painting 'ālekhyakarma' was more suitable. This discussion about the meaning of painting is considerably relevant. Other texts, when became more specific explain *'chitra'* the 'representation of whole body in the round (sculpture) 'Chitrārdha', the representation of the body of which only a part or half is shown (sculpture in relief) and 'Cnitrābhāsa' as what represents the written (likhita) with brush etc., on high or low walls or paṭṭa (canvas). Such technical distinction of 'Chitra' and particularly 'Chitrābhāsa' is of scholastic significance but in common usage *Chitra* in ancient Indian times denoted painting and *pratimā* was understood for sculpture. Since the similitude to nature (lokasādṛśya) is the prime factor to *chitra* (chitre sādṛśya karṇaṁ pradhānaṁ, V. D. III. 42. 48) it denotes to all kinds of art, whether sculpture or relief sculpture or painting. In the classification of *chitra*, it is stated that *chitra* (sculpture in round) is rated at the highest, *ardhachitra* (sculpture in high or low relief) the next in the order of excallence and painting itself (chitrābhāsa) only after these two and also accordingly styled *ābhāsa* or semblance of sculpture, with the third dimension lacking in reality but suggested by a technique calculated to create an optical illusion. In the 'Śāraswat Chitrakarma Śāstra' (Summary given by Raghvan in I. H. Q. 1933. Vol. 9) similar classification of art and painting is given. But this text takes *chitra* in a wider context, and includes sculpture also in the definition of *chitra*. In the 'Śilparatna' it is mentioned in the begining that all places and gateways should be decorated with various paintings (manoharatarāṁ kuryannānāchitraira vichitraṁ 46. 1). Here it appears that *chira* is explained in terms of sculpture as well as painting. Painting is not excluded from the definition of chitra Further the author of 'Śilparatna' gives distinction of *chitra*, *ardhachitra* and *chitrābhāsa* as the three classes of *chitra* in general (tatchitraṁ tu tridhājñeyaṁ). In which there is depiction of all parts of body is called *chitra* (Sarvāṅga dṛśyakarṇaṁ chitramityabhidhīyate etc. 46. 3), in which the half that is shown as cling to the wall etc. is *ardhchitra* (bhityādau lagnabhāvenaupardhaṁ yatra pradarśyate tadaradhchitraṁ. 46. 4; and *chitrābhāsa* is when the object is painted (Vilekhanaṁ), The 'Vilekhana' is explained as to beautify a thing with various colours (yathā yukti yathā śobhaṁ nānāvarṇaiśchabhūṣayet, sudhābhiḥ, snigdhabhityādau yuktavarṇaivilekhayet (46. 7).

Here it is to be pointed out that the distinction of *chitra*, *ardhachitra* and *chittrābhāsa* is with reference to architectural embelishment and thus *chitrābhāsa* is specific reference to wall-painting.

The origin of painting, according to Nagnajit to the 'Chitralakṣaṇa' is credited to a *Chakravarti* King at the instance of Brahmā, who painted a portrait of a Brāhmaṇa boy, who died untimely, to infuse life in him. In the 'Chitrasūtra', the origin is credited to sage Nārāyaṇa who painted the picture of a Urvaṣī to vanish the pride of other nymphs who approached to him. It is said that the great sage used mango juice (sahakāra rasa) to create a peerless nymph (vara strīyaṁ). This account of origin of painting indicates the element of beauty and likeness as the key-note of painting. A close relationship of painting with dance is pleaded in the 'Chitrasūtra' and thus the scope of painting is explained to be the portrayed of the three world (trailokyānukṛti. 45. 5). Similarly in the 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of 'Śilparatna' it is said that 'the representation of objects in accordance with their individual nature, movable and immovable found in the three worlds is called *chitra* (jaṅgamā vā sthāvarā vā ye santi bhuvanatraye, tattatsvabhāvatasteṣāṁ karṇaṁ chittramuchyate 46. 2) In the 'Chitrasūtra' the dance is made the model for the practice of painting. Thus, it is said the glances, thè moods, the limbs and all their auxiliaries, the desposition of hands in dance may be rendered in painting. According to 'Chitrasūtra', *nṛtya* is *pramāṇa* for painting.[2]

While any subject from the three world is approved, 'Chitralakṣaṇa' indicates that the 'scenes of war, even between the gods and demons, death, misery, performance of ascetics and depiction of naked figures should not be executed in the human residence. There on the wall-surface etc. should be drawn bigger paintings depicting the benevolent stories natrated in the *Āgamas*, *Vedas* and *Purāṇas*. These picture should be painted in different beautiful colours, applying them neither too much nor too less, to meet the requirements of forms, sentiments (rasa) and moods (bhāva) and actions. Apart from these, the inauspicious paintings, which produces bad effect, should not be painted (7–13). The 'Chitrasūtra' gives a comprehensive themetic plan for painting (ch. 42) specifying sages, *Gandharvas*, *Daityas*, *Dānavas*, ministers, astrologers, royal priests, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Vidyādharas*, *Kinners*, *Yakṣas*, *Piśāchas*, *Rākṣasas*, *Nāgas*, *Gaṇas*, courtisens, house hold women, *senāpati*, warriors, announcers, *mallas*, *pratihāras*, traders, servants, animals, entities of nature such as rivers, mountains, night, day, rain, seasons, cities, forts, market-places, battle-fields, crematorium etc. 'Śukranīti' gives mandatory imposition on the portrayal of human beings and suggest various gods or goddess to be imaged or painted.[3]

'Chitrasūtra' of 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' suggests various ways of depictions and says that they should to depicted with full luster following their norm of dress, behaviour, actions, proportions, decked with ornaments, moods, physical marks, symbols etc. The author gives emphasis on semblance, as the supreme factor in painting (chitresādṛśyakarṇaṁ pradhānaṁ (42. 48) and instructs that the artist should study the difference in features, dress, ornamentation and complexion and accordingly depict people in their special characteristics (42. 49). Only after the close study of the object of painting, the artist should depict the theme with meticulous care (yatnataḥ). Study of nature and mood and also the rules of dance is essential for a painter.

The 'Chitrasūtra' classifies the painting and provides hints to the judgement for determining the qualities of a good or a medium painting. Thus it is said that the pictures are of for varieties, *Satya, Vaiṇika, Nāgara* and *Miśra.* Further it is explained that *Satya* is the faithful portrayal of any object of the world (yatkiñchit loka sādṛśyaṁ chitra tatsatyamuchyate 41. 2). It has the limbs somewhat elongate through following proportions in all other respects (dīrghāñga sapramāṇa). This kind of painting is delicate in treatment (sukumāra) and with the right background (subhūmikaṁ 41. 2).

Stella Kramrish has explained *Satya* as realistic, in an oblong frame. Coomarswami besides oblong added square and round frames. C. Sivaramamurti rightly observes that mounting and framing was never vogue in India. The positive meaning of the words *Chaturasra* and *vartula* in relation to *Satya* class of paintings refers to symmetry and roundness of the figures.[4] The other qualities like *dīrghāñga* and *sapramāṇa* also refer to the qualities of figure and not to the canvas. *Lokasādṛśya* refers to true nature. Similarly delicacy is brought in by making figures sway or rest in the instance of great charm almost floating than striding or walking.[5] In the 'Śilparatna' (46. 145. 146) there is mention of *Viddha chitra.* It is characterised by 'sādṛśyaṁ likhyate yattu darpaṇe pratibimbavat'. We will study about the full implication of 'mirror like reflection'. But this quality refering the similitude is the quality of *Satya* type of painting also, But C. Sivaramamurti, rightly observes that *Viddha* is a distinct type of painting signifying an accurate portrait study from life.[6]

The next class of painting is named as *Vaiṇika.* (41. 3). What is styled as *Vaiṇika* is symmetrical, complete in its form (Chaturasra susaṁpūrṇaṁ), with no elongation of any limbs (na dīrgame nolbaṇākṛtiṁ), no exaggerated of form, in true proportion and rich in stances (pramāṇasthānalaṁbāḍhyaṁ).

Stella Kramrich defines *Vaiṇika* class of painting as rich in postures, maintain strict proportions, placed in exactly square field, nor phlegmatic, nor very long and well finished. Coomarswami takes it to be lyrical and square-framed. Motichandra takes it to be of right measurement, provided with suitable background, possibly purely decorative motifis in square and rectangular panels appearing in Ajanta and Bagh paintings. C. Sivaramamurti explains that this class of painting is symmetrical, free from any exaggeration, in true propositions, complete in form and pleasing in its arrangement of postures. It is pleasing as the melody of the *Vīṇā* and close to lyrical composition in poetry. Priyabala Shah takes the word *Vīṇā* on which the word *Vaiṇika* is derived and explains that this class of painting refere to a regional variety in Dakṣiṇāpatha. 'Vīṇā' to her, refers to the river Krisṇaveṇvā.[7] Thus, she gives a geographical background to the classification of painting. She proposes that *Nāgara* the third variety of painting of the 'Chitrasūtra' as the paintings of North India as against the *Vaiṇika* which refers to the South Indian painting.

Nāgara in the 'Chitrasūtra' (41. 4) has been defined as a class of painting 'which has all its limbs well rounded, firmly and powerfully set, though not too exaggerated (dṛḍhopachitsarvāṅgaṁ vartulaṁ na ghanolbaṇaṁ) and with great restraint in jewellery and garlands as decoration (svalpamālyavibhuṣaṇaṁ).

Taking the literal sense of *nāgara*, Stella Kramrich takes this class of painting as 'of city', round with firm and well developed limbs and with scanty garlands and ornaments. Coomarswami considers it 'urban and secular as opposed to *Satya* or sacred (Sāttivika). Motichandra considers it as the 'classical style' characterised by the firm body, colour-modelling with preference to curves, excess of every kind avoided, with limited jewellery and floral ornaments. C. Shivaramamurti calls *nāgara* as a sophisticated and restrained style of execution of pictures where all the limbs well rounded, firmly and powerfully set, not too exaggerated and with restraint on jewellery etc.

The above mentioned characterization of the above mentioned classes of paintings are not tangible. The meaning of words like *Nāgara*, *Vaiṇika* and *Satya* is not clear in the texts and explaination of these terms by the modern scholars are also hypothetical. As a matter of fact the distinguishing qualities of respective painting are applicable to all kinds of good paintings.

The fourth class of painting is called *Miśra* which represents the mixture of the characteristics of the three styles, known as *Satya*, *Vaiṇika and Nāgara.*

We have referred to above the *Viddha* type of painting given in 'Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi (1. 3. 939). 'That kind of painting is which there is drawn likeness to the nature of each figure (tattadrupānusāra) with likeness (sādṛśyaṁ) as if reflected in a mirror (darpaṇa pratibiṁbavat) is called *Viddha* (hit off). When painting is made according to prescription and unsupported by a model is called *uddiśya*. When no model is provided for the representation (ākāramātra-saṁpattve) it is *aviddha* type of painting. C. Sivaramamuri defines *Viddha* is a portait of a chosen individual, *aviddha* is a sketch without much care for accuracy in depiction.[8] But V. S. Agrawala notes that *aviddha* is merely *ākāra,* which means 'any general facial form as opposed to portraiture.[9]

Further in the 'Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi' there is reference to *bhāvachitra* in which various moods (śṛṅgārarasādi) is to be painted. The *bhāvas* are inner feelings, but it appears that the author suggest that the portrayal of such persons are to be made in whom such *bhāvas* are embodied. As the *bhāvas* have inner actions, which effect the physical behaviour, there fore procedure of making such painting depends upon the observation of the bodily changes and of the facial features (darśanād gamyate). Such paintings are specially amaging (Kautukakārakaṁ).

On the basis of the material used in painting there is reference to *rasachitra* and *chūrṇachitra.* The former is made with liquid pigments (dravavarṇa) and the latter is done with powder, pigments (chūrṇitvarṇa). This type of painting is also called as *dhūlichitra* in 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of 'Sri Kumara' (46. 146).

The 'Chitrasūtra' is very specific in typological grouping of persons to be portrayed. It mentions *haṁsa*, *bhadra*, *mālavya*, *ruchaka* and *śaśaka* types (pramāṇas) in the frame of which various persons and other subject should be painted. Main consideration in this sort of classification is of height. Thus, *haṁsa* variety should follow the height of 108 *aṅgulas* (of the artist according the text). The height of *bhadra* is 106, of *mālavya* 104 and *ruchaka* 100 and *śaśaka* 90 *aṅgulas* (35. 9–11).

In the 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtrādhāra' also this type of classification is given (ch. 81) with specific measurement of bodily features. But besides the bodily features, the 'Chitrasūtra' gives at length the specific type of people to be portrayed in the painting. In case of women of each variety they must be given height to the shoulder of men. Their hip should be larger by 4 *aṅgulas* than, men and waist should be thinner than the men by two *aṅgulas*. Other characteristics are also defined. Thus *haṁsa* variety of women should be 'fair like moon, honeyed in eyes, mighty with arms like the snake king Vāsukī, of lovely gait like a swan, pleasing and attenuated in the waist and of sweet countence. The *bhadra* class of women should be of lotus-hue, elephant gait, great in wisdom, with ample rounded arms and bushy cheeks. The *mālavya* women should be shown of light dark green-pulse complexion, attenuated waist beaming sheen, long arms nearly reaching the knee with powerful shoulders and prominent nose. *Ruchaka* type of females should be fair like the autumnal blossoms, conch-necked, great in intelligence and truthful in speech, a true connoisseur of art and poetry and powerful in strenght. *Śaśaka* class of women may be portrayed with reddish dark complexion, slightly inclined to be grey, with rounded cheeks and honey-red eyes and cleaver in her wit[10]. The significant point in this kind of suggestion in *rūpanirmāṇa* is that, besides the physical features the mental and inner qualities are also considered. The specific features, which are due to the functional nature of beings are also determined in the portrayal. The classification of 'pañchapuruṣa-strīlakṣaṇa' of the 'Chitrasūtra' and of 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra is summerised below :—

Figure	*Pramāṇa*	*Other essential characteristics*
1. King	*haṁsa*	*mahāpuruṣa lakaṣaṇa*
2. *Chakravarti*	*haṁsa*	*mahāpuruṣa lakṣaṇa Jālāṅguli, Ūrṅā*
3. *Ṛṣis*	*bhadra*	*Jaṭāmukuṭa Ajina,* weak, emaciated but with full of effulgence
4. *Gandharva*	,,	with crown

5. *Daitya, Dānava*	*bhadra*	frightful features
6. Minister	,,	modestly bejewelled, wearing turban.
7. Astrologer	,,	,,
8. Priests	,,	,,
9. *Brāhmaṇa*	,,	In white apparels, with *śikhā* tuft, full of effulgence etc.
10. *Vidyādhara*	,,	With couple, with *mālā* or *khadga,* flying in the sky.
11. *Kinnara*	*Mālavya*	1. human face and equine body. 2. Equine face and human body, horse face, kinnara should be bejewelled, and with musical instruments.
12. *Nāga*	,,	with hood, pleasand courtinance and bejewelled.
13. Rākṣasa	,,	Hair straigtened and tufied on the head, fearful eyes etc.
14. *Yakṣa*	*Ruchaka*	with *alaṁkāra.*
15. *Piśācha*	No specification	
16. *Gaṇas*		With faces of different animals, with variety of weapons, and with various actions of sports.
17. *Mānava*	*Śaśaka*	
18. *Vaiśya* and courtiers	*Ruchaka*	attired in flambayant dress and ornaments with erotic mood.
19. Household women *Kulastri*	*Mālavya*	Shy, gaudy-dress, with quantimum jewels.
20. Traders (Vaiśya)	*Ruchaka*	Turban with their dress in consonance with their caste or profession.
21. Śūdra	Śaśaka	,,

These are mere examples. The divine figures are to be rendered in different prescribed *tālas*. The 'Chitrasūtra' however indicates in general, for the guidance of the artists for portraying such themes as one witnesses all around him in his daily norm of life. Birds and animals should be depicted in their natural surroundings and in close conformity to what is observed in Nature. The objects easily could be observed and studied should be so sketched and painted as to lay stress on their proper semblance to the original. The 'Chitrasūtra' also explains the portryal of objects which cannot be seen. There is also the suggestion of allegorical representation of personified aspects of Nature around, such as rivers, mountains, oceans, sky, night and day, seasons, etc. Similarly the portrayal of *nidhis*, *āyudhapuruṣas*, Gaṅgā-Yamunā, towns or villages and other figures of iconographic importance. The iconography of different gods and goddesses are also described in detail in the chapters dealing 'pratimālakṣaṇa' (44–83). The figures of gods, generally to be dipicted in *haṁsa-pramāṇa*. They are to be handled with much more elaboration than that of the other four types. Beside from just aesthetic reason ·it was important to the Indian artist to paint each god according to the correct rules because if he made even a small mistake his efforts would be waisted and he might anger rather than please the diety. For instance the eye of a god which is for the welfare of the people should be red at the corners, have a black pupil and long eye-lashes. However if one desires wealth and happiness the eyes should have the colour of cow's milk, and be placid, even, wide, serene, and pleasant to look at. It should have eye-lashes that slope at the end and a black pupil. The face should not be triangular or crooked but should be full and square. It should be well finished, benignant, and marked with all of the auspicious marks. Large circles, triangles, and other geometrical shapes should be avoided when representing gods if one wishes good to the people for whom it is painted. A gods hair is to be shown only in the eye-lashes and eye-brows; the rest of his body is to be devoid of hair. His form should always be that of a youthful person of sixteen years and he must always have a serene face and smiling eyes.

A figure could appear in nine different positions (sthānes) or in variations of them. They are (1) Ṛjjvāgata front view, (2) *Anṛju*—back view, (3) *Sāchīkṛtaśarīra*—bent position in profile view, (4) *Ardhavilochana*—face in profile, body in three quarter profile view, (5) *Pārśvāgata*—side view proper, (6) *Parāvṛita*—with head and shoulder bent and turned backwards,

(7) *Prīṣṭhāgata*—back view with upper part of the body partly visible in forlorn profile, (8) *Purāvṛtta*—body sharply turned back from the waist upwards, and (9) *Samanata*—back view in squating position with body bent. These positions are obtained in painting with the help of decrease end increase or foreshortening. It is interesting to note that ancient Indians studied foreshortening, and proportion even to the point of actual human dimension.

The nine postures, as C. Sivaramamurti[12] points out, can be better styled views as they are the same straight *ṛjju*, viewed from different angles, to show the same figure, with postures of body hidden from view in different proportions, causing for shortening and on that account styled in different nomenclature. The 'Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi' states that in all such positions the central line is called *brahmasūtra* (191) and in relation to its position to the vertical said lines (bahisūtra) determines (*ṛju*, *ardhaṛju* and other positions. This texts provides clear clue to the proportions of *kṣaya* and *vṛddhi*. The *paravṛtta* of the 'Abhilaṣitārtha' corresponds to *pṛṣṭhāgata*, *puravṛitta* and *samanata*. Similarly the positions described in this texts such as *ṛjju*, *ardhaṛjju*, *Sāchika* are *ṛjjvāgata*, *anṛju*, and *sāchīkṛta-Śarīra* of the 'Chitrasūtra'. Other positions such as *dvārdhākṣī* is *ardhavilochana* and *bhittika* or *pārśvagata* is *pārśvagata* of the 'Chitrasūtra'. To illustrate and explain the positions we may quote C. Sivaramamurti who indicates that 'in case of *ṛju* is 6:6, *ardhaṛju* is 8:4, *sāchika* is 10:2 and *dvardhākṣī* is 11:1, *bhittika* the text mentions *bhaktika*)-1.4.90, also called *chāyāgata* is a complete side view and so is practically the same from both sides, having no front or rear view. As all the three *sūtras* merge, there is no separate *brahmasūtra* and appear as one line.[13]

The 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Śrīkumāra follows 'Abhilaṣitārtha'. According to this text *ṛju* is frontal, *ardhṛju* is half-frontal, *sāchika* is askance, *dvardhākṣī* is one and half quarter eyed, *parśvagata* is sidelong or profile and *paravṛtta* is dorsal stances. The *pūrvabhāga* (fore part) is the front side and *para-bhāga* is the hind part or the back side. The line called *brahmasūtra* should be drawn through the middle of the tip of nose and the middle of the navel and sketching from the head-gear to the feet is the exact middle line which is called *ıqahmasūtra* (63-65)

The 'Chitrasūtra' describes[14] with some amount of aesthetics notes. In the case of *ṛjjvāgata* it is a complete, clear and simple front view (abhimukha) with no diminishing of any part of a limb (akṣīṇagātraṁ) and so it is clear and neat in its outline *susuddhaṁ* and *spaṣṭarekhāsaṁskārabhūsitaṁ*, full in the face, chest, stomach, waist, shoulders and thighs. *Anṛju* has one-third foreshortening of the main limbs on one side though it is one fourth for the smaller ones like the nose and lips. It is the most pleasing view (kāntarūpaṁ paraṁ sthānaṁ). *Sāchīkṛta* is a diagonal view indicating a figure side-ways with part of body diminished to a quarter (chaturbhāga). It is midway between *ṛju* and *bhittika* or *chhāyāgata*. The latter is so named as it has no two distinct sides-front and back and is a complete side view like the shadow on the wall. When on the diminished side of *sāchīkṛta*, there is further reduction of a half it is *ardhavilochana*. In the case of the *bhittika* or *pārśvagata* or *chhāyāgata*, used as it is the same when seen from either side, presenting only one eye, eye-brow, ear, nostril, half lip, half chin and so on, the rest hidden from view. It is a complete side view. The rest of the four views that make up the nine are the views from the rear or the back view. *Pṛṣṭhāgata* shows a little of the eye (side-glance) cheek etc. Such figures mostly occur in panels. *Chhāyāgata* or *bhittika* from the rear show quite a portion of the body except where it is diminished. It corresponds to the frontal pose *ardhavilochana* where the view of the buttocks is complete and the toes are hidden completely and nothing of the face, or neck is visible, it is *samanta* full rear view. *'Chitrasūtra'* points innumerable possibilities of shortening situation, technically known as *kṣayabṛddhi*, but suggests that most popular among the artists are of thirteen type (43. 39), which are above described. The shortening effect in painting by three methods of shading (vartanā) namely, *pattrakā*, *binduka* and *raikhika*. The *pattraka vartanā* is called as it is composed of lines cross-hatched in leaf pattern. The *raikhika vartanā* is composed of very fine lines (stumping) and *binduvartanā* is called because it is effected by stipping (dots) (ch. 41. 5–7).

With this kind of seemingly comprehensive understanding of realistic painting i. e., whatever the artist represents placing one figure in front of another the artists love for each minute object or form as a whole containing all he has to express about the whole nature that stopped him from covering up anything. Thus the idea of employing over-section as a logical step in the scientific progression is probably ignored. The concept of verticallity is more prominent in such suggestions.

Since the strict proportions of the body is rigorously to be maintained, the *tālamāna* in its various aspects is also given in all the texts, particularly in the 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Nagnajit.

The technical aspects of painting are elaborately discussed in the texts. First point is preparation of ground. The 'Chitrasūtra' in case of mosaic floors or *bhitti* suggests brick powder (of three variety-smooth, middling and coarse) should be mixed with clay, in third of its proportion. To this should be added fregrant gum resin, bee's wax, honey, grass, molasses, safflower soaked in oil-all in equal proportions. To these, two parts already composed is added powder of lime three-fourth burnt, with *bel* fruit pulp and lamp black. The rest or remaining fourth part is an addition of sand. Then it is soaked in water stored in a pot so as to get lubrious and is kept so far a month. Then it becomes a very soft paste. It has to be carefully taken out and a coat applied by the artist on the wall after testing that it is quite dry. The coating should be smooth, even, firm, free from uneven patches, neither two thick nor too thin. When the wall is dry after this coat and is still not quite smooth, it should be smoothen by an application of the clay bereft of *sarajarasa* and oil by coats of lamp black and frequent welting of the surface with milk and rubbing. The wall dries up soon and does not perish even after a hundred years. (Chitrasūtra, 40. 1–9). The 'Chitralakṣaṇa' of Śrīkumāra describes differently about the preparation and applications of plaster in relation to wall painting. (46. 14–25). It describes that the wall should be plastered with lime, and thereafter, painting should be executed. As the second process, lime (sudhā), made of conch-shell etc. burnt in wood-fire and pulverized, should be mixed up as dust with some levigated kidney bean (mudga) and molasses in the proportion of four to one. Molasses diluted in water should be sprinkled on it after adding some sand to this preparation. The proportion of sand should be one-fourth of lime. This should, again, be added with *Kālāgni* and banana pulp, and the proportion of this paste should be one-fourth of lime. This (lime preparation) should be put into a tub and thoroughly pounded. After three months, this should be placed in a stone vessel and, smearing some molasses water, be pasted with a pestle till it becomes as soft as butter (14–19).

Now wall etc. should be properly cleaned and sameness of level attained. This should be then kept wet for half a day (i. e. twelve hours) with the juice of molasses applied on it by the tip of a loosely made fine coir-brush. Lime plaster should next be applied by the trowel is large as well as of other kind in accordance with the requirements, and it is made either of iron or of wood and its backside should be plain. With the help of the back of this trowel lime plaster should be slowly applied by stages leaving no unevenness to it. Again, pure water should be smeared bit by bit with the help of a coir-brush, and water being dried, colour should be applied for the delineation of painting. On wooden plaque etc. colour should be applied after smoothening them with the help of an abrader. Lime plaster should not be done on wooden plaque etc. for painting (20–25).

On the lime plastered wall etc. white priming should be made. Conch-shell, oyster-shell etc. or white clay should be turned into dust and an intelligent (painter) would mix it up with the juice of elephant apple and *niṁbā* and would slowly apply on a wall or a wooden plaque, according to his desire. The juice of the bark of *Śākhoṭaka* or that of the leaves of *Ketakī* should be repeatedly applied till the ground becomes very smooth. (27–30).

As the second process, an expert would throw lime dust into the pit of a mortar, and after pulverizing them again and again with a pestle that should be moistened with coconut milk and again be pasted. Then the pulp should be thoroughly mixed with hot water so that it melts. Now following the previous way, this should be applied on the lime plaster. But this cannot be used on wooden plaque, though may be applied on clay etc. (31–33).

In this way, after whitening the wall, panel and cloth as resembling the surface of a mirror, the drawing of painting should be started. Following the same process painting should made on carriers like cloth and panel (34–35a).

In every texts dealing with painting colour is given great stress for colour attracts, to the paintings. It has great influence on lookers and stimulates certain feelings. Colours effect them both symbolically and emotionally. The 'Chitrasūtra' mentions five colours as *mūla raṅgas* (primary colours). They are white, yellow, red, black, blue and according to the artists knowledge and capacity hundreds and thousands colour tones are produced. (40. 17). Further, it is indicated that blue and yellow mixed produced green. It may be pale with a greater modicum of white or deeper with blue. Blue mixed with white is a tertiary colour which again is manifold by predominance. Red *lakṣā* tint mixed with white like the *lodhra* flower becomes red like the red lotus. According to the colour used quantitatively, there is a predominance of a colour, lighter, darker or in equal proportion making it threefold. With one tone predominant many tints are produced such as yellowishgreen, light wood-apple green, green pulse etc. Beautiful tints are produced by mixing in calculated proportions.

The 'Chitrasūtra' also refers to the material for colours, which are gold, silver, mica, lapis lazuli, red led, yellow orpiment, lime, red lac, varmilion, indigo and several more manifold (42–25–26). Metal colours are to be laid in delicately thin sheets or by liquefying them by chemical methods. The 'Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi' also describes the pure (*suddha* for *mūlaraṅga* of the Chittrasūtra) and the mixed (miśra) colours. The account of such colour schemes are as follows :—

For the whites, lay on conch; for the crimsons (śoṇa), cinnabar (darada); for reds (rakta), lac-juice (alaktaka-rasa); for blood-red (lohita) ochre; (165).

For yellow (pīta), orpiment (haritāla) will serve, for black (kṛṣṇa), lampblack (kajjala) is prescribed. These four pure colours (śuddhavarṇa), aforesaid) consort in painting (166).

On the other hand, the colours produced by combination are called mixed colours. Cinnabar mixed with conch gives the *Kokanada* complexion. (167).

Lac (alakta) mixed with conch will be like the solar streed; ochre mixed with conch is reckoned to be a smoky shade (dhūmrachhāhyā); (168).

Orpiment mixed with conch represent the terrible; lamp-black mixed with conch is reckoned to be the shade of smoke; (169)

Indigo-blue (nīla) mixed with conch displays the pigeon hue (kapotābha); lapis lazuli (rājāvarta) is just like the flower of flax. (170)

and this blue (nili) by itself matches (sannibha) that of the blue lotus; when it is mixed with orpiment, the green (harita) tone prevails; (171)

ochre mixed with orpiment, results in pale-yellowness (gauratā) lampblack combined with ochre is reckoned to be black (śyāma) colour; (172)

lampblack mixed with lac (alaktaka) becomes livid (pāṭala), colour of the 'pāṭalī' flower, lac combined with a little blue becomes a blooming (sphuṭa) purple (karbu ?). (173)

Thus the distinction of pure and mixed colours have been set forth; they are to be filled in by painters according to the character of each figure; (174)

for deer, tigers, partridge, and (the like) creatures of broken colour (bhinnavarṇa) make use of variegated (pṛthaka) colour; (175)

for trees, mountains, weapons, (sastra) or (vastra 'garments') the appropriate broken colours are to be used by painters in their painting. (176)

For things of yellowish (gaura) hue, or blue, first lay orpiment; then use ochre for the yellowish and blue for the blue. (177).

Yellow ingredient (pītavarṇa-dhātu = yellow orpiment ?) born in mountains, river beds and other places, should be collected, washed in pure water and pulverized. It should be gently ground on stone and then be agitated in a jar full of pure water and kept therein for a moment. Leaving the sediments suspended below, the water containing pigment should be shifted to another receptacle and the said process should again be followed . This process is to be repeated as long as necessary for removing impurity and, thereafter, that essence should be carefully smeared as a slip on a new earthen pot and dried under the heat of a summer sun by an expert in accordance with the rule. Red ingredient should be collected and made purified in the same way and be dried similarly. (41–46).

Putting oil and a lengthened wick in a lamp, it should be lit. An earthen pot (*ghaṭa*) should then be brought and, after having besmeared its inside with fine cowdung dust, it should be placed upside down over the flame of the lamp. Thereafter, the lamp black, born of the wick of the lamp, and sticking inside the pot, should be carefully collected and smeared on an earthen vessel. Collecting it again and adding pure water to it, this should be pasted by on hand and fully dried. This combination of three should again be added with the *nimba* gum and levigated and dried up. Later on others are also to be powdered. (47–51).

Greenish stone (śyāma-dhātu) should be ground along with pure water for three hours and again be pasted after adding the gum of elephant apple and be dried up. (52).

The brush should be made of high quality hair (V. D. III. 30). The 'Chitralakṣaṇa' mentions three types of brushes—flat (sthūla), medium (madhyama) and fine (sūkṣma). The stick of a brush should be of six *yavas* in length. The artist should make the one-eight part of both of its ends either eight sided or round, and then place a very hard and barly-corn shaped iron peg of half an *aṅgula* height at its front end. The hair should be collected from the ear of a calf for a flat one, from under the belly of a goat for a medium one and from the tail of a *muskrat* or tipps of grasses for the fine one and should be tied with the help of a thread or lac to the peg placed at the top of the handle. For each colour there should be three shades, and the shape of the brush should again be of three types (flat, medium and fine), hence for each colour there should be nine brushes. Crayon should also be used for outlining. (46. 58–60).

The painting with brush should be made with colours strengthened by the glue of elephant hide, the guice of grass (dūrvā) and bark resin. In the contemporary Āndhra painting (kalamakārī) the colours are derived from vegitation and hence called *vanamūlīkā*. It is the term for colour.

The first sketch should always be made with black colour or crayan which should be made with dust of olden bricks anb dried cowdung with cold water in a grinding pot. The crayan should be made in the shape of a candle stick in the lenght of two to four *aṅgulas*.

First the mental image should be conceived after performing rituals. Thus in the 'Chitrasūtra' of Viṣṇudharmottara' it is suggested that the painter dressed in immaculate white, pure in the mind and body, having adorned Vedic sears and uttered auspicious hymns, and having bowed to the learned in the art and the masters in their order, and with great affection for the masters, facing the last, contemplating on the deity to be depicted should start this work of painting (40. 12–13). In sketching, the 'Chitralakṣaṇa of Srikumār adds, 'Gods or men, animals, reptile or birds, trees and creepers, mountains and seas, ascertaining their form either by hearing, or by seeing or just by meditation, should be drawn in crayan in the auspicious moment, remembering then again and again, by the artist, seated at ease and possessing a resolute mind (46. 37–40). Thus, it is very significant that the source of form is not only derived from the actual object (what is a matter of seeing) but, also hearing as well as meditation. According to the 'Abhilaṣitārtha' the painter must be a man of discrimination (vichakṣaṇa, dhīmāna, chitravidyā-viśārada) and should be sure to carry out the drawing in all its parts in the same scale (tan-māna) as that of that which seen by the mind (dṛśyamānasya chetasā). Skill of painting is the primary requirement of a painter, hence he should be resolute, well skilled in drawing fine lines (sūkṣmarekhā viśārada) in modelling (patra lekhana kovida) and in filling the colours (varṇapūraṇadakṣa) and also should have the capacity to display various passions (rasas) in painting (46. 136–140). The 'Chitrasūtra provides the details of elements of *rasas* in chapter 43 with other specifications.

From the point of view of the aesthetic note and pictorial effect the real painter is 'who can draw the ear in a natural way without any ornament on it (Karṇam chāpyaalaṁkṛtaṁ) who can depict one wounded by an arrow and in great pain (śalyaviddhaṁ) and an aged one with the difficult marks of eye (vṛddha), who can point movement of wind, the waves, the wave-lets and ripples, flames of fire and smoke, fluttering banners and apparel blown by wind, depict the difference between a sleeping pig that is alive and breathing and a dead one bereft to life (suptaṁ cha chetanāyuktaṁ, mṛtam chaitanya vivarjitaṁ). He should also be able to depict variations in heights and depths determing light and shade. (nimnottaṁvibhāgaṁ) and also arrange the figures with proper arrangements in the composition, with special care that one figure should not super-impose the other (Chitrasūtra, 43. 24–30).

In case there is some mistake in drawing, etc. the artist should remove the defect with the edge of the scraping knife (Kṣura) what ever is poor or excessive. In erasing the incorrect elements a piece of new cloth also may be used. The removal must be done with gentle hand after the defect is removed the outline should be redrawn to improve the respective figures.

Pictoral effect is the key–note of a painting especially relevant to aesthetics. It is said that slowly and spotlessly filling in colours with a flat brush in suitable order, with special effects of depressions and protrusions should be achieved by the expert artists. Everything should be made to appear pleasing by the differentiations of darkness and brightness and the orderly placing of hardness and softness. In application of an individual colour, effect of thickness is dark and that of thinness is bright. This is also achieved by different colours, Where yellow stands for the bright, these red would be the dark. Border line should be carefully drawn in lamp black with a fine brush. To effect white of finger nails etc. filling in colour of the surface should be removed with the help of a *Sharp* knife (46. 113–118).

But the total pictoral effect is well described in the 'Chitrasūtra'. Here it is mentioned that painting is the foremost art. Of all the art the best is *chitra* (Kalānām pravṛaraṁ chitraṁ)[15]. It gives fruit of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*. Wherever it is established in a house, it is the herbinger of the best auspiciousness. Just as *sumeru* is the best of mountains, as 'Garuḍa' is the foremost of the birds, as the king is the chief among men, similarly the *chitra* is the most praiseworthy among the fine arts (kalānāmiḥ chitrakalpaḥ, 43. 38–39). The 'Chitrasūtra' specifies eight *guṇas* of painting. They are appropriate stances (sthānas) proportions (pramāṇa), background, (bhūlambha) sweet execution and distinctive symmetry (madhuratva and vibhaktatā), semblance (sādṣśya) to the original and foreshortening (kṣayavrdhi) (41. 9, 43. 16). That picture is considered auspicious which has the background that fits it (lasatīva cha bhūlambha) and almost embraces it by being appropriate (śliīyatīva), when its sweet execution almost smiles (hasatīva cha mādhuryaṁ), where the figures seems to be alive and breathing (sajīva ive drśyate, 43. 31).

Besides the eight qualities the four elements are also mentioned in the 'chitrasūtra' (41. 10-11) necessary for a good painting, for they are the aesthetic determinants. These four elements are line (rekhā) shading (vartanā), decorative designs (bhūṣaṇa or alaṁkāra) and colour (varṇa). It is interesting thing to note these determinaats have special appeal to specific people. Thus, masters are all praise for excellence in line work (rekhāṃ praśaṁsayantyā charyā). While connoisseurs value excellence in shading (vartanāṁ cha vichakṣaṇāḥ), feminine taste prefers decorative art (stṛyo bhūṣaṇamicchanti) the others in general have a liking for rich colours (varṇāḍdhyamitare janāḥ) in painting. (40–11) But whatever may be the case of special liking and taste the best painting is that which wins the heart of all (sarvasya chitta grahaṇaṁ 41. 12) and appear as if alive and breathing (sasvāsa iva yacchitraṁ tutcchitraṁ subhalakṣaṇaṁ 43. 22).

But in order to present a good painting the painter should avoid the defect in stances (sthāna hīnaṁ) flaw in depiction of emotions (gata rasaṁ) a vacant look (śūnyadṛsti), smudgy (malina). It should not be devoid of life and movement (chetanārahitaṁ). Painting must not be devoid of auspiciousness, defective in form (hīnāṅga), tainted (malinaṁ), vaccent (śūnya), agitate by being overpowered (vaddha), disease (vyādhi) or fear (bhaya) struck, wild with dishcvelled hair (prakīrṇakeśaiścha). The specific defects of painting are (located in line and colour. Weak drawing (durbala), coarse line work (sthūla), crooked (vibhakta) or awry lines (vakra), muddling of colour (varṇa śaṅkara) are the major defects of painting. (Chitrasūtra 43. 17–18, 22, 24). The aesthetic qualities also determine the typology of painting. The picture with excellence but bare line work and lacking in modelling is called *śuṣka* (dry) and is the second best. That which is produced with exceilent modelling is called *ārdra* (moist) and is the best. The inferior type which is neither simple like *śuṣka* nor highly finished like *ārdra*, but is an admixture of both, *suskādra* (dry and most). It is the least attractive. The ptcture painted in confirmity with the region (yathādeśaṁ), time (yathākālaṁ) form (yathādehaṃ) and age (yathāvayaḥ) is the best. A good painting sets off the process of the master artist (vichakṣaṇa buddhi) who can use his excellence in aesthetic creation (kalpitaṁ) to the adrantage by stress on pleasing stances for figures (sthāna) brilliance in hue, portraiture of emotions and grace (karaṇakāntivilāsarasādbhiḥ) in situations, as all these gladden the eyes in inviting attention and assuring all that the heart desires (42. 82-84).

The concept of organic unity in relation to painting is very significant. Some theorists define the various elements (aṅga) of painting from the point of view of functional unity and some consider it from the point of view of total aesthetic effect

When the concept of organic unit in painting was first formulated is difficult to determine. The 'Kāmasūtra' of Vātsyāyana refers to the word 'ālekhyakarma' among the sixty-four *kalās* (1. 3. 15). In this work or in any work contemporary to this, the concept of six limbs of painting (ṣaḍaṅga) is not clearly occurs, hence an early dating such as sixth century A. D. for this concept is not possible. We have referred to that as the organic concept of painting four elements—line (rekhā), shading (vartanā), decoration (bhūsaṇa) and colour (varṇa) are mentioned in the Chitrasūtra (41-10). This text does not refer to *saḍaṅga* concept of painting as a whole. Commenting on 'Kāmasūtra' Yaśodhara for the first time (11th century A. D.) defines painting (ālekhyaṁ) as six—limbed (ṣaḍaṅgakaṁ). These limbs are *rūpabhedāḥ* (differentiation of form), *pramāṇāni* (proportions) *bhāva* (sentiments), *lāvaṇyayojaraṃ* (arrangement of beauty), *sādṛśya* (likeness) and *varṇikābhaṅgaḥ* (style of brush and colour work)[16]. These six constituents of painting are to inspire attachment (anurāga) of others and for the purpose of one's own diversion (ātmavinodārthāni).

In the same century the king Bhoja, the author of 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' mentions (71. 13, 157) eight elements (aṅgas) of painting (chitranyāsa) including the brush (vartikā). It appears that *vartikā* as an element of painting, particularly in the present context is not merely a brush but it denotes the brushwork also. The next element, *bhūmibandhana* is preparation of painting surface or ground. *Lekhyaṁ* or *lekha*, the third element is preliminary draft in line. The fuller treatment of line in terms of form and figures is *rekhākarmaṇi*. *Varṇakarm*, the colouring is the fifth element of painting. The sixth element is known as *Vartanākarma*, which is sequence of shading. The *lekhakarmaṁ* is the final drawing. *Dyutikarma* is the last element and refers to brightening or finishing touch.[17] In the same text there is another mention of factors related with quality and methodology of painting. In this list there is reference to (1) *Vartayaḥ* (brusees) (2) *Kṛtabandha* (preparation of the ground) (3) *lekhāmāna* (size and measurement of lines) (4) *Varṇavyātikram* (variation of colour), (5) *Vartanākrama* (modelling etc.), (6) rules of *māna* and *unmāna*, (measurement of length, breadth and height), (7) rules of the nine *sthāhas* (positions) as well as juxtaposition of the hands (hastavinyāsa) and (8) size of various feature (akritimāna) and imparting of proper form or beauty (rūpa-vinyāsa). Some casual observations are relevant to consider, which give emphasis on one of the few elements, normally referred to above. Thus, Nārada. (as quoted by Raghavan),[18] suggests that there are only two noteworthy elements in the painting—one, fine lines (aviṣamarekhā) and the other bodily proportion in accordance wi h the *brahmasūtra* (aviddhasūtrapāta) P. K. Agrawala explains the latter as observation of anatomical rules.[19]

Of all the elements only some as matter of choice has been considered as the significant in painting. Thus. Ratnakara (9th century A. D.) says 'only a few rare are known to create auspicious compositions like painters who are able to draw true lines (satyam rekhām vilakhatuṁ chitrakarmavido). Here the lines are considered the supreme achievement.[20] In 'Kuvalayamala' of Uddyotansuri[21] (778 A. D.) a painter is quoted to have said' I know the work of paintitg that is endowed with the principles of line, pose and sentiment and also the colour composition'. In the same work a painted cloth is appreciated for the purity of lines (rekhā viśuddhaṁ) beauty of distinctive divison of colours (suvibhatta-vaṇṇasohiyaṁ), graceful looking rendering of shading (lalita-dīsanta-vittinīvirayaṇaṁ), and well defined bodily portions (supaiṭṭhiya-angovāṅgaṁ). The 'Upamitbhavaprapañchakathā' indicates skill in faithful lines, appropriate decoration, colour scheme in proper sequence, explicit manifestation of emotions. Dhanapala (11th Century A. D.) besides these qualities, such as perfect drawing (samyag abhilikhita) combination of colours etc. refers to greaceful effect of light and shade (prakāsitavyaktanimnonnatavibhāga) and reflection of life (chetanā) as the good qualities of painting.[22]

Haridasa Mittra[23] grouped the six limbs of painting in to two—one relating to aim and the other with the technical methodology. Coomarswami, however, took these limbs of painting in the technical and practical sense as against the subjective views of Abanindra Nath Tagore, who drew the attention of scholars to this theory. Tarapada Bhattacharya has ably attempted to compare the consituents of six limbs of painting with various topics discussing painting in the 'Chitrasūtra', Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' etc. He brings us to the conclusion that the 'six limbs' of Indian art productions and the methods indicated in the texts suggest that every painting or sculpture must have distinct forms, must maintain proportion and symmetry in its size and measurement, must express same *rasa* (or bhāva), must be beautiful, must be proporly coloured and must be as real as possible.

These qualities of painting have been considered by Abanindranath Tagore forming an organic entity of painting. He has also compared these *aṅgas* with the six limbs of painting of the chinese canons discussed first by Haich Ho (479–501 B. C.). Considering this he has proposed that the theory of *Saḍaṅga* is earlier than the chinese theory and it was essentially an Indian concept which was adopted in the sixth century B. C. by Hsieh Ho. The chinese concept regarding the six limbs of painting is as follows[24] :—

1. Chi-yun Sheng-tungw—Spiritual tone and life movement. rhythmic vitality (Giles). Spiritual rhythm expressed in the movement of line (Hirth and Binyan) Abanindranath compared it with the *rūpabheda* which he translates as 'Knowledge of appearance'. He considers that the quality of rhythmic vitality is essential in the form or *rūpa*. He has clearly mentioned that *rupa* in this context is not for beauty.

2. Ku-fa Yung pi—Manner of brush-work in drawing lines. Giles translates it as 'anatomical structure skeleton drawing with the brush (Hirth), The art of rendering the bones or anatomical structure by means of the brush (Binyon). To Abanindranath it is equivalent to *pramāṇāni* i.e. correct perception, measure and structure of forms.

3. Ying-wu hasiang heing—Form in its relation to objects. Conformity with nature (Giles), correctness of outlines (Hirth), the drawing of forms which answers to natural forms.

4. Sui-Lei fu-tsaiw—Choice of colour appropriate to objects; conformity with nature (Giles); the colouring to correspond to nature of objects (Hirth). Appropriate distribution of colours (Binyon). This element is comparable with *varṇikābhaṅga*.

5. Ching-ying Wei-Chih—Composition and grouping; artistic composition (Giles); the correct division of space (Hirth); composition and subordination or grouping according to hierarchy of things.

6. Chaun-moi-hsichw—The copying of classic masterpiects. Finish (Giles). Copying models (Hirth). The transmission of classic models (Binyon).

Okakura has summerised the six limbs of painting into two following groups.

1. The Life—movement of the spirit through the Rhythm of Things. The great Mood of the Universe, moving hither and thither amidst those harmonic laws of matter which are Rhythm.

2. The Law of Bones and Brush-work. The creative spirit, according to this, in descending into a pictorial conception must take upon itself organic structure.

Avanindranath Tagore was fully conscious of the fact that the total comparison of Indian concept of *Ṣaḍaṅga* with the 'six limib' theory of the chinese pictoral art is not possible. But some points of common-ness is obvious. To him *Rūpabheda* is supreme like *sumeru* in the rosary of all other *aṅgas*. In this element the concept of 'rhythmic vitality, of the chinese principle is inherent. Manner of brush-work, the second element, which is according to Giles translation is anatomical structure refers to two entities-line and measurment. The third element—form in relation to object or conformity with nature is *sādṛśya*. The fourth element relating to the process of colouring is *varṇikābhaṅga*. Compositional factors of the chinese theory are not clearly mentioned in the *Ṣaḍaṅga* theory, though in *rūpabheda* and *pramāṇa*, the principles of composition is indirectly implied. The sixth element 'copying of classical masterpiece or copying models has not been considered as essential element of painting by the Indian theorists, hence has no place in the *Ṣaḍaṅga* theory. While Avanindranath considered all the five *aṅgas* as substituary and subordinated to *rūpabheda*, one may feel that the elements of *Ṣaḍaṅga* were to achieve the similitude (sādṛśya). *Rūpa* determined by *pramāṇa*, decked by colour, and graced by *lāvaṇaya* enriched by *bhāva* correspond to similitude.

References

1. B. N. Goswamy and A.L. Dahmen-Dallapicolla. *An Early Document of Indian Art*. p. XIII
2. *Chitrasūtra*. of V. D. ch. 35. 5-6.
3. *Śukranīti*, IV. 77.
4. *Chitrasūtra*, pp. 65-66.
5. Ibid., p. 66.
6. Ibid., p. 67.
7. Priyabala Shah, *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, Pt. II. pp. 119-125.
8. *Chitrasutra*, p. 66.
9. *J. U. P. H. S.* Vol. XXIII, p. 10 fn.
10. *Chitrasūtra*, pp. 75-76.
11. Ibid., of V. D. ch. 42 pp. 185-187.
12. Ibid., p. 54.
13. Ibid., p. 55.
14. Ibid., p. 56-57 and ch. 39 of V. D.
15. Ibid. ch. 43. 38.
16. P. K. Agrawala *Ṣaḍaṅga-Canons of Painting*, p. 47.
17. *Transformation of Nature in Art*. p. 102;
    Canons of Indian Art p. 402;
    Ṣaḍaṅga-Canons of painting p. 78.
18. *I. H.* Q.Vol. IX. p. 910.
19. *Ṣaḍaṅga-Canons of Painting*, p. 82.
20. *Harivijaya*, 32. 70.
21. *Kuvalayamala*, p. 185.
22. *Upamitbhavaprapañchakathā*, p. 87 quoted in *Saḍaṅga-Canons of painting* pp. 82-84.
23. Haridas Mittra quoted in *Cannons of Indian Art* p. 405-407.
24. Hindi version of the article of Avanindranath in *Sāhitya Sammelana Patrika* (Kala-aṅka) pp. 402-403.
25. Ibid., pp. 403-422.

VII

Form and Simlitude

Form is *rūpa* and as such it is perceptable to eyes and the object of senses (Chakṣurmātra grāhya jātimānaguṇo rūpaṁ)[1] It is an artistic element of every work of art. We have referred to above 'mānasī pratirūpā chākṣusī' which also confirms that the form is the subject of visual perception. Form is a priori, according to Kant,[2] for the expression of all kinds of aesthetic sensibility and perception. Form is determined by the inner as well as outer sesnsibility. Hence form has two aspects—inner and outer. Inner sensibility refers to mental perception and imagination. The outer refers to concretisation of external form through certain medium. The former i. e. inner perception is 'idea' and external perception is matter. This state of affair pre-supposes not only the double aspect of form but also two formal entities. The inner form is mental image and the external form is concrete image. The constituents of the mental image (form) are intention, intution, and to concrete image is matter presented in desired shape and symmetry. Aristotle have explained,[3] matter as 'indifferentiated mass'. It is 'receptacle' of forms. In matter there is unlimited potentiality for taking all possible forms. Impressions of forms do not change the essential character of matter. It remains basically the same under all forms. The impressions of form on matter are momentary. Continuity of form on matter depends on the continued permanency of the same form in the matter once impressed or shaped. The transformation of matter into image is due to 'idea'. In Aristotlean philosophy 'when an idea comes into contact with matter, it breaks up into many particulars. Each idea having been split up into many particulars, we have multicity of objects, which are subsummed under are universal. The entire world of Nature is due to the influence of ideas on the external matter. All realities which things possess, is due to the influence of ideas. The objects owe their being to the presence of ideas. But the ideas, in the opinion of Aristotle is not transcedental in relation to matter.' They are immanent and exist in matter. Ideas are the directing forces or purposes of things. They give things (matter) form and life. Ideas are progressively realised in matter Therefore idea or form is the possibility of matter. Realisation of form by matter is the realisatton of its own possiblity.

Aristotle further discusses[5] the problem of matter and explains ihat 'matter is not being an inert. It is dynamic. In the world of experience it is always found together with form. It moves, changes, grows and evolves forwarded. Matter is of two kinds–primary and concrete. Primary matter is not the object of experience; it is mere possiblity, mere logical postulate. Concrete matter always has form. It is in a sense actually. But it is a possibility in regards to some other form'.

The distinction between form and matter also can be understood. The matter is identical in the raw material and in the finished product. Raw material also has a form and cannot be described as formless. But the distinction can be explained that raw material is formless in the sense that it has not yet the form, which it is to acquire through transformation into finished product. The trans formation of matter into form is a result of thought-process as well as a matter of technical skill and perfection. Thought process includes a number of things. Planning, intention, emotion, feeling etc. which are the elements of planning and they are also 'raw material of the another kind' and affect form as well as matter. Execution is material concretisation of thought. As the skill in execution, the nature of material (for the matter also resists the form—it is not always receptable either to idea or to shape desired for form), similarly the planning and thought process affect the form. The matter is always there in the shape of raw—material before the form is impose upon it, and the form is there in the shape of a pre-conceived plan before being imposed upon the matter, and as the two coexist the matter might have accepted a different form or the from have been imposed upon the different matter. Planning and intention, in this way, are the main determinants of form.[6]

Intention is pre-requiste of art and it determines the theme, content and form. Intention is 'will to create', which is an inthrent quality of artist. It is a mis-concept that Indian art is the dictate of religion, and artist was not free to 'act at will'. Either he followed the will of a devotee or the command of king as patron. For patronage the artist had to wait for the patrons. But there is no instance in art-history of India that there was any imposition of his 'will' during the course of his creation. Once he was entrusted with the work he acted as an artist of free will, which of course was guided by his own artistic traditton, which was one of the determinants of the formation of his 'will to create'. In this way Coomarswami has rightly observed the status of an artist as a consumer. Intention of the artist according to him 'to supply a real or imagined heed or deficiencey on the part of the human patron, for whom as the collective consumer the artist works. When he is working for himself, the artist as a human being is also a consumer'. It is also to be borne out that in the poetics also the poet is considered as 'bhogin' (consumer of art).

Intention of the artist as a matter of fact, covers the whole meaning of the work of art. Therefore there is great relationship between the 'intention' and the 'result'. In general concept intention is indemonstrable and if at all it is guessed it is through the result of his production. The aim of the artist can be detected internally in the work even where it is not realized. It is suggested, sometimes, that proper intention is to evaluate the work itself, but as 'evaluation' has much more to do with 'what the work ought to be 'than the another intended it to be, sometimes the evaluation alone is not a detarminative factor of intention, for it represents more the intention of the critic than the artist. A work may fall short of a critics standerd, but actually there can be no evidence, internal or external to indicate that what the artist had conceived, had not executed in his work of art. Therefore theoretically it can be considered that intention works at the two levels. True intention always remains in the the artist and the reflected intention only is embodied in a 'form'.

But though the real intention of the artist may or may not be reflected in the artifact, (may be due to his lack of technical skill–kauśala) in the Indian concept intention of arsist is explained under the concept of 'kāma'; which is considered as the basis of all creative astivities of human beings. Art in a sense is the creative desire, urge or impulse articulated in a matter. It is externalisation of desire of intention in a concrete form. Inter-action between intention and matter produces the form. Intention represents the invisible world of idea, vision and thought and matter (as form) is the visible world of reality. Thus, equating intention with idea, art can be defined as 'idea (unmanifest in the material) is a sensible form (in the material medium).

The principle of production of form is based on several concepts. Most popular and ancient is imitation. Imitation is in born behaviour of mankind. Nearer to imitation are the principles of illusion and reflection. Some forms are idealized and some forms are made of the symbolic principles. Naturalism are two opposite concepts of form. Natural form advocates very much the principle of imitation, while symbolic and idealized form take depart from imitation and naturalism. Often they are intellectually conceived. Some theorists of the West determine[7] six elements of aesthetic form. There are the principle of organic unity (or unity in variety), principle of the theme, principle of themetic variation, balance, principle of hierachy and evolution. D. H. Parker explains that by principles of organic unity' means that each element in the 'work of art is necessry to its value, that it contains no elements that are not necessary and that all that are needful are there (in the form). The value of the work (form) as a whole depends upon the reciprocal relations of its elements; each needs, responds to demands, every other element in the nature of co-operative deeds. Such organic unity is not merely in relation to external form only, but as a unity within also.

De Witt H. Parker calls this principle of Organic unity as 'the master principle of aesthetic form; all the other principles serve it'. Next important principle is of theme, It determines the dominant character of form in relation to theme. Predominance of themetic form, again can be determined by shape, size, line, colour as well as meaning. In a complexed nature of composition the form is very much determined by the individucal roles played in the entire composition, particularly in the narrative panels and scencs. In such art the themetic predominance of form was emphasised even at the cost of percepective.

The third principle of themetic variation is to be explained that even of the same theme is repeated by way of various depictions, there must occur variations in presenting the various forms. This would avoid monotony. The principle in doing is 'maximum of sameness with minimum of difference'.

The fourth principle of 'form' is balance. Balance is one kind of aesthetic unity, for 'despite the opposition of the elements in balance, each needs the other and together they create a whole. The balance is essential in the elemental opposition and contrast of artistic creation. Balance is also required in between the value and quality of art. In sculpture and painting the compositional factor is mainly ·governed by the principle of balance. Threefold balance, horizonal perpendicular, and diagonal determine specifically the form. The relationship of form with space is also a governing factor. Indian principle of *tāla* (in music) *mātrā* (in poetry) and *tālamāna* in painting and sculpture are relatively significant in controlling the organic and anatonomical balance of form. In the same way compositional factor of form to be determined by geometrical patterns and plan, such as *pañjara* or *khila-pañjara*. The formal sequence is necessary for balance. Rhythmic unity is an essential quality of form. But balance and rhythm are not identical. Rhythm has two fundamental aesthetic elements—one form (governed by theme) and the other by balance.

The last and the sixth principle of form is evolution. Parker explains that this is the unity of a process when the earlier parts determine the later and all together create a meaning. This is one of the greatest phenomenon of narrative depictions. In narrative panels the artist has to be very choosee about the forms. He must not receive what is not related to theme. This factor, as a matter of not significant from the point of view of 'form' proper, but important from the point of view of the 'choice of the form'. In the course of narration form, as pointed earlier, is determined by sequences. Each incident determines its precidents and all incidents determine the destroy of the form (and character) involved. This process provides not only the formal unity, but the aesthetic unity also.

A purely academic problem arises whether there is any distinctions between form and content. This distinction becomes acute when as a consequent form is apparent and content is obscure. Content of form constitutes meaning of art, both explicit and implicit. The manner and method by which the meaning is brought forth is its form which is varied as a in exhaustable the content itself. They cannot be seperated. The creative idea and imagination involves form and contents into one, though both inter-act and represent integrated unit. If there is transgression in form, the meaning itself becomes diffused. But this situation occurs only if the form as meaning (content) is clear to spectator. He is sensible to form as well as meaning in the same degree. He will feel the co-ordination between the two by a quite peculiar power of grasping the possible correlations. But if there is less understanding of either of the two, the situations become uncomfortable particularly in relation to the nature of Indian iconic forms. Indian iconic forms are not always akin to natural forms or even in the seeming with the forms of Nature and are imbibed with rich symbolism and diversified with supra-natural forms or idealized forms. Sensibility to such form without pre-intangibility may effect the understanding of the relationship of form and content. At the same time, too much sensibility to meaning and content; (as it may be in the case of a devotee) reduces the form to a secondary significance. In such situations (particularly In the late mediavel art of India) there is deplorable tendency to subordinate form to knowledge (of symbolism) which has affected adversely the principles of aesthetic 'likeness'.

But the general attitude of Indian artists, however was more towards the idealization of natural forms with a view to create abstract spiritual types and this may be considered as the supreme achievenement of Indian artist through the ages, In the attempt of idealization the Indian artist always had this in mind that the form always should be pleasurable to senses and emotive so that it may engage the attention of the devotee or the spectator. For, the aim of rendering of form was ultimately directed to achieving the pure delight (ānanda) and leading the artist and the perceiving subject beyond itself (form).

George Santayana in his 'Sense of Beauty' defines form as unity of manifold. This unity produces charm, hence the form becomes essential for the concretisation of beauty. While considereing the form in terms of beauty he refers to three primary element of beauty which as a matter of fact are inherent in the form itself. According to him[8] the formal constituents of beauty are the (1) the material, (2) form and (3) expression. He would appear to be saying that works of art have material, which are organized into pattern. Such organised material is after expressive, which when presented with as specified matter and forming an organic unity it is subordinated to two fundamental ones-material and form. This concept emphasises the value of form in which expression is self explicit. If we have to look for beauty, we have to look at form. In great art, beauty of form and beauty of thought are purely synthetic product. We shall have never a work of art which in not a work of thought. A work of thought, therefore also is a work of art for the very same reasons that a work of art is a work of thought[9].

Conceiving form in terms of beauty, G. Santayana has fully realises that there is beauty in form, which provides essentially a sensual delight.[10] Though beauty of form manifests the expression but beauty of form cannot be reduced to expression only. Form itself is a kind of unity of a manifold, perception, patterning of constituents such as line, symmetry, which appeals to us through charm of recognition and rhythm, in which the principle of individualisation is also envolved. Beauty of form is, what specifically appeals to an aesthetic nature; it is equally removed from the crudity of formless stimulation and from the emotional looseness of reverie and discursive thought. The indulgence in semtiment and suggestion. to the sacrifice of formal beauty marks an absence of cultivation as real. The synthesis, which constitutes form is an activity of the mind; the unity arises consciously, and is an insight into the relation of sensible elements separately perceived. The variety of form depends upon the character of the elements and on the variety of possible methods of unification'.[11]

As against the idea of emotional looseness and crudity of form an image is logically a 'compact form'. This concept of Santayana is similar to Amarakosa, which describes 'mūrti' as '*kāṭhinya kāyayoḥ*' Here *kāthinya kāyahoḥ* not only represents the solid mass of the image but the compactness of ideas We shall come to this point a little later.

Style is an essential consideration of form. It is fundamental importance of our standing of artistic forms. Meyer Shapiro[12] characterizes style as 'the constant form-and sometimes the constant elements, qualities and expression— in the art of an individual or a group. J. S. Ackerman[13] argues that the concept of style is a construct of an ensemble of conventions and symbolism of a given period, which ensemble is sufficiently stable, distinct and relevant to justify the historian hypothesizing it into a style. Style thus, provides a structure for the history of art. It is most compreheusive to include the study relationship among individualworks of art as well as the technique or the process by which 'matter' is given form'. It is most sensitive elements for the study of tension between stablility and change; between the existing forms and the invention of new ones. The relationship of stability and change varies according to the pace and degree of individualisation of a culture. Similarly the technique may be a fundamental stylistic determinant; this occurs because usually it is not merely a means, but serves important formal or symbolic functtons.

Nearest paralled to the concept of style is the concept of *rīti*, comprehensively propounded by Daṇḍin (first half of 8th Cent. A. D.) and Vāmana (800 A. D.). Vāmana describes *rīti* as *viśisthapada rachanā*; i. e. the particular kind of formal arrangement, a peculiar disposition or pasture of parts. (Literal sense of *rīti* is specific arrangements of words). If it is *ātṃā* of *kāvya* (*rītiātmā kāvyasa*) it is also the soul of all arts. It is, according to Vāmana, is a special quality (Viśeśaguṇātmā) of art. In 'Bhāminīvilāsa '(3. 19) *rīti* is appreciated as a quality which provides sweetness to expression (rītiṁ girāmṛitvṛṣtikariṁ). It has universal approval as the quality of art and form (sarvatraisa vihita ritiḥ). Viśvanātha in his 'Sāhityadarpaṇa'[14] says that it provides special flavour to *raṅga*, *rasa* etc. The essential quality of *rīti* according to him, is *padasaṅghaṭnā*. The concept of poetic *rītis* is based on *guṇas*, which has no utilsty in the form as discussed in the *Sāhitya Śāśtras* in determining the styles of form of art and architecture. But as the *rītis* have their ramification on the basis regions—*Gauḍī*, *Vaidarbhī*. and *lātī* etc. the art forms also have their regional ramifications to be determined by their constant form, element, qualities and evpression. The qualities (guṇas) of artistic form are determined by the form proper and by their element specialities, (as the form of *śīkhara* and the form of *maṇḍapas* in determining the architectual styles of temples) and the aesthetic quality of *chārutā*, *ramaṇīyatā*, *manohartā* etc and ultimately the perception vision. The moral value in relation to form is very much considered in the western aesthetic thinking. In Indian forms also this value (bhadra) is significantly recognized. These elements of form are the significant determinants of style in all Indian visual arts–sculpture, painting and architecture.

The classification of form in Indian art is done on two grounda geographical and dynastic. In architecture, the ancient attempts have been made on geographical basis. But the evidence we get only in relation to temple architecture and painting and not of sculpture. As sculpture is an essential element of architecture, it would not be unreasonable to class the style of sculpture in accordance with thelr temple—style. Probably this was the reason that our ancients have not classified the sculptural styles separately.

In the modern histriography of Indian art the determination of form and style has been done on different considerations. It is more obvious in sculpture and painting and effects the stylistic classification of architectural forms also. In the recent attempts the identification of certain group with the ancient nomenclature, such as *Vālabhī* (the temples of Malavā). *Khākhara* with certain Orissan temples for Sakti by Deble Mittra and *Bhūmija* with the temples in Mālvā, mahārāska Rajasthāna etc. by Krishna Dava; *māru Gurjara* in Gujrat by M. A. Dhaky etc. But more successful attempt have been made by modern scholars on the basis of dynastic patronage and periodical as well as regional idioms in relation to forms and styles. This is a valid and approved practice for painting as well as sculptural forms and styles.

We have referred to above the concept of *ṣaḍaṅga* in relation to painting. All the six elements cannot be compared with six qualities of elements of form above mentioned. The concepts differ. But the fundamental element of form i. e. organic unity' can be explained not only in the physical term but also in aesthetic term. It is the later sense the principle of *Ṣaḍaṅga* can be adopted for understanding the organic unity of form. The theory of *Ṣaḍaṅga* of ancient Indian painting organically explain 'froms', its individual status and it is relevant not only with paintings but sculptural arts also. *Rūpabheda* which the first essential of form as a matter of fact gives emphasis on the individualization of forms. For the individualized form, simlitude *Sādāśyatā* is a primary condition, which is constituted by *pramāṇa* (tlālamāna), *bhāva, lāvaṇya,* and *varṇikā bhaṅga* (if paint is applied to sculpture, which really occurs in the same of the ancient sculptures even in stone).

Indian aesthetic forms are also affected by the special specifications of *sthāna*, *āsana*, *mudrā*, and facial expression (bhāva) etc., particulars in relation to the divine images.

A Divine Image which is variously denoted as *pratimā*, *mūrti*, *biṁba*, *pratikṛti* etc. are nearer in the sense to English word 'Image' derived from old French and Latin 'Imago' which in basic connotation suggests the sense of 'likeness'. In its functional aspect an image of god is also an *archā*, *vigraha*, *liṅga* even the *yantra*. *Liṅga* and *yantra* are iniconic forms of god, hence out of scope of our present study. *Archā* and *vigraha* more or less belong to the same category. *Biṁba* and *pratikṛti* give greatest stress on the actual or mirror like reflection in form of a divine being (darpaṇe pratibiṁbavat). The 'Śilparatna' insists on resemblance i. e. an image should reflect the Divinity like a reflex in a mirror[15]. How for the actual appearance of a Divinity can have a mirror like reflection in a material object ?. The *śilpī* has not seen the Divine being. More over, reflection is a simultaneous process. Here one is involved in a deeper and vital question—what is the relationship of a real form with an art form. The distinctive significance of the two forms was a vital question for the traditional thinkers also. Therefore, instead the mirror like reflection mostly the ancient theorists describe the resemblence and likeness within the practical limits. The 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa', considers as we have noticed earlier *Sādṛśyaṁ* as supreme factor in creating a form. (Chitre sādṛśya karṇaṁ pradhānaṁ).[16] This *Sādrśya* is not the natural form but nearer the natural form. Regarding the source of art-form in the same text it is said that it should be derivied from the forms of Nature as seen in the three worlds (trailokyānukṛtiḥ). The word *anukṛti* in its ordinary meaning is imitation. But imitation is not art. Therefore the text indicates *anukṛti* together with *sādṣśyaṁ* constitute the form. In other words the forms should be delineated on the analogy of things found in the world. This process of analogy is a process of the activity of the mind (Chitta). Hence analogy derived or an image conceived in the mind may have the element of similitude but not the exactness.

Similitude with the visual objects, if attained in an artistic creation, is true art. Thus, it is said that whatever painting depicts in the resemblance of the world is called true image (Satya) (Yat kiñchidlokasādṛśyaṁ chitraṁ tadsatyaṁ[17]

Similitude or *lokāsādṛsya* is determined by two factors—intention (Chitta) and action (Kṛyā). These two are also the determinants of form in art. The abode of intention is *chitta,* (mind) which is reflected in the image or *chitra.*[18] Thus, a *chitra* is a thought out product of human consciousness. Buddha has explained in the 'Sārathappakāsini' that whatever products of art there are in the world, all are thought by the mind. (Chittenevā chintitanti chittakārena chintititvā or Chittena chinntitaṁ nāma) Coomarswami describes all art as imaginations i. e. the images have reference originally to the mind of the artist, and not to any natural *pratyakṣa* models.[19] The fact of mind (Chitta) is recognized so essential in artistic creations that according to the *Śukranīti* the imager must be expert in vision (*dhyāna*) and in no other way, certainly not in the presence of a model (pratyakṣa) can the work be accomplished.[20] Therefore even if the artists has not seen a form or *rūpa* from his own eyes; which is *parokṣa* he can perceive a form, through *dhyāna*—a mental activity. The Divine or which is *parokṣa* is given a visual form *(Chākṣusī)* in art as a *pratirūpa* through a mental activity (mānasi prtirūpā chākṣusī). Therefore as noticed earlier what is the *pratirūpā* of Him (Yadvai pratirūpaṁ) is the art (tadśilpaṁ).[21] In other words whatever is a reflection of Nature (= Vai) is art.

But the reflection of Nature in art does not result the *anukṛti* or formal imitation of Nature, as it is generally accepted. N. R. Ray on the basis of free rendering of a passage from the 'Aitareya Brāhmaṇa' (IV. 5. 1. 5) which says that all human arts should be in the conformity with the arts of Divine, indicates that the art instead initiating the actual form of the Nature, should follow the laws of Nature i. e. the laws of balance, proportion, rhythm, harmony etc, in Nature, symbolised by the term *chanda.*[22]

Once this is accepted, the scope of form in art is permitted to its limitless extensions and also a clear distinction can be made between a *parokṣa* form and a *pratyakṣa* form. Coomarswami has perfectly understood the distinction between the two forms and has pointed out in his famous article 'Paroksa' as indicated above that the lotus of iconography (or art) is not the lotus of sensible experience. Most of the accidents proper to the lotus of the botanist are omitted from the symbol of lotus in art.[23] This distinction is also related with the meaning of art. While pure form or actual form may be without meaning or may be more relevant with the utilitarian shape the artistic form is related with the accepted value, and since the form itself is the result of consciousness; an artistic form is never without meaning. The meaning is so relevant with form that form itself is considered as the progressive realisation of meaning and idea. Idea and meaning is perceptible. So long the idea is an end of the product of a mental activity and imagination it has no form. But when same idea is articulated, it takes a body and the idea is embodied into a form. Therefore the degree of form articulated depends upon the degree of idea conceived or realised. Indian iconographers have taken full advantage of this conceptual situation, while determining the form of a divine. Thus, while presenting Buddha, the Sākyamuni or the historical Śākyasiṁha, in the form of a divine image, they had latitude to combine the concept of a *Mahāpuruṣa*, *Chakraavartī* and *Mahāyogi* into one. They had also concession to conceive a form of Buddha in an intellectual or academic context. The Sarnath Buddha, is a Budha in image intellectually conceived. This image is an embodiment, of Buddhahood than the Buddha himself—a historical being. A classically conceived image of a Divine, whether of Buddha or any other god is the result of a standardized ideals of Divinity, intellectually conceived and skillfully articulated. On comparision, one may find, in classical art of Greece also the image of a divinity delineated in similar terms characterised by radiance, harmony and self contentment. Such ideas about divinity not derived through any direct natural phenomenon but through the intellectual experience of the being himself. This is the reason that differentiation of form in a divine image (rūpabheda) is often determined by textual or iconographic indications. Such images though iconographically represent different gods, intellectually follow the same common denomination of spritual experience conceived with reference to a Divine image.

A Workable plan, suggesting the scope of form is given in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa.* Besides the general statements, such as *trailokyānukritiḥ* there is a suggestion that in the works of art (chitre) the artists should depict the gods (devaṁ) according to their respective forms. Further difference of forms of a *ṛsi*, a *gandharva*, a *daitya*, a minister, a king, a priest, as well as the *Paura-Jānapadas*, *Śresṭhi* and a *nāgara*, should be made according to their respective realistic forms. Most of the fanciful and utilitarian shapes, though conceived mentally and rendered technically, do not constitute an art form though functionally useful. To give one example, pure geometric forms, known as *yantra*, though meaningful and functionally useful do not constitute to art. The three points (vindus) and six concentric circles (Ṣadchakra) are popular in the *tantra* worship and they represent Divinity also (trikoṇe vasati devatā) but this as well as *yantra*, is a mechanism to represent Divinity, but not a Divine image. They are devoid of artistic realities, though they have social and religious relevance. The artistic realities are determined by time and space, the tradition of formal articulation and conceptual similitude. All these elements are determining factors in presenting the differentiation of form, which is exclusively significant for the articulation of iconographic forms. Unless the artist is conscious of *rūpabheda* i. e., diversity in forms, he is not able to represent the Divinity, which according to Indian thought assumes manifold forms. The theory of one unmanifest or not fully manifest Divine Being, which manifests into many and many fold divinities is common to all religions based on *Saguṇopāsanā* in India. For eg. one Brahma becomes many through his desire. (Ekoahaṁ bahusyāmi). One Ādikeśava evolves into twenty four Viṣṇus. One Ādiśakti, Mahālakṣmī presents herself into many Durgās. One Ādi Buddha becomes manifest into a thousand Buddhas, etc. Not such Divinities in form, but certain abstract Divine ideas are also given forms. For example, the three elements (tṛtattava—sat, rajas and tamas) are personified in 'Trimurti'. Five fundamental elements of the universe (the earth, the water, the fire, the space and the wind) are presented in the form of five faced Sadāśiva representing these elements under the name Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Aghora, Tatpuruṣa and Īśān.[24] *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are personified in the image of Ardhanārīśvara etc. Later, when the concept of divinity became all comprehensive, the Indian iconography conceived forms for various good and evil emotions (bhāvas). For example the form of the desire (Kāma) has been conceived in human form, with a bow (Chāpa) having the flag with the emblem of *makara* (makaraketana).[25] The feelings such as *mada*, *asūyā* *mātsarya*, *īrṣā*, *dambha*, *ahaṁkāra*, *bhrama*, even *mṛtyu* other than 'Kāla' or 'Mahākāla' has been conceived in human form by late iconographers.[26] It would be not out of place to mention that in the *Devī Māhātmya*[27], the goddess (Devi) is eulogized as the embodiment of various emotions such as *chetanā, nidrā, kṣudhā, tṛṣṇā, lajjā* etc. by making such *stuties* :—

Yā devī sarvabhūteṣu lajjārūpeṇa saṅsthitā etc.

In presenting such abstract and invisible ideas and emotions personified in the human forms, the principle working behind is that such abstract feelings and ideas should have the form on the analogy of things found in the world. (Yathā-lokaṁ drṣtvā......adrṣtanaṁ)[28] Therefore, for the personification of emotions (bhāva) the form should be conceived like a person in whom the particular *bhāva* has reacted and caused change (vikriti) by way of *anubhāva* and *sañchāri*. In the 'Śṛtattavanidhi' the feelings are personified on this principle. For example, the feeling of *mada* is personified like of drunken man whose eyes have become red due to over intoxication. (madarakto) and his a stomach is like a pot (Kuṅdodara). *Asūā* is *tāmrakeśa, kuñchitākṣa, kṛśodarī mātsarya* is of blue colour and *mahodarī*. *Īrṣā* is *vikṛtānanā* and *tundila* as well as *tunganāsā*. *Daṁbha* is *raktamukhī* and *chitravarṇaḥ*. *Ahaṁkāra* is *bhṛkuṭīkuṭilekṣaṇaḥ* etc. In the *Varāha Purāṇa* we find that the Seven Mothers are mentioned as the personifications of seven feelings in man such as *nidrā, kṣudhā, tṛṣṇā, lajja* etc.[29]

For giving form to certain natural objects such as rivers, ocean etc. Indian iconography provides the principles that they may quite differently be treated from the principle of similitude (Sādṛśyaṁ). They may also be presented in the human form. Thus, according to the directives of 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' rivers should be shown in human form holding a pitcher in the hands (pūrṇakuṁbhakaraḥ) and mountains with showing peaks in hands (Śikharapāṇyaḥ) (III. 42. 51–53).

But such forms are to be represented only when they are required to be depicted independently and as gods or goddesses. Otherwise, when to be shown as natural objects particularly in the narrative panels, or as background such as sky, earth, mountains etc, they are to be represented on the basis of the principles of similitude. For example, the sky should be shown colourless, full of birds and the celestrial dome should be shown with stars etc.[30]

The theory of similitude has also worked in ancient Indian art in the presentation of certain symbolic forms as an alternative to the real forms. The best example of this may be seen in the Śunga Art, in the scene depicting the legend of Muchilinda. Here the Nāgarāja is shown in the real form i. e. in the serpentine form and also in the human form in which the hoods, the symbol of *nāga,* is shown over the turban of the *Nāga* king. The same principle is adopted in representing some of the 'Vibhava-mūrtis' (incarnatory forms) such as 'Matsya', 'Kūrma,' 'Varāha' etc. According to the *Rūpamaṇḍana*, 'Matsya', 'Kūrma' should be presented according to their normal natural forms (Matsyakūrmasvarūparūpo).[31] But they also could be presented in human form. In the early Medieval art there are various examples in which 'Matsya' 'Kūrma' 'varāha' are shown in human form, and fish or tortoise is shown symbolically either on the head or depicted as *vāhana*, below the feet or on the pedestal. In the same manner the *āyudhapuruṣas* or *āyudhadevis* are shown. Normally the weapons and symbols of the gods are shown in the hands in their natural forms. But in the early Mediaeval art 'Chakra Puruṣa', 'Gadā Devi' etc. are shown in the human form, the emblems depicted symbolically. The god places his hand mostly in the *pālita mudrā* over the head of the weapon represented in human form. In the same manner the *vāhana* of Śiva. Nandi (as Adhikāra-Nandi) and of Viṣṇu, Garuḍa are personified. We may refer to a Buddhistic image of Vajra Tārā from Ayodhyā in Orissa, flanked by four goddesses shown in the *padmāsana* holding objects of *pūjā*. These four goddesses are identified with *Puṣpa*, *Dhūpa*, *Dīpa* and *Gandha*.[32] Similarly in the Buddhist pantheon, Prajñāpāramitā is depicted in the book form as well as in the form of a goddess. As a matter of fact depiction of Prajñāpārmitā in the book form gained a secondary and symbolic importance and in the human form became so popular in all Buddhist countries that a separate cult evolved around it. Like Prajñāpārmitā twelve philosophical deities are personified in the Buddhist 'Sādhanamālas' under the names Ratnapāramitā, Dānapārmitā Śīlapāramitā, Kṣanti pāramitā, Vīryapāramitā, Dhyānapāramitā, Prajñāpāramitā, Upāyāpāramitā, Praṇidhānapārmitā, Balapāramitā, Jñanapāramitā, and Vajrakarmapāramita.[33] Here we find mostly the human mental and physical qualities are transformed into the form of a goddess. The 'Śaktinidhi' chapter of 'Śṛtattavanidhi' recommends the forms of various kinds of knowledge, scriptures, *śikṣhās*, *varṇas* and *akṣaras*, This kind of tradition was not exclusive to any time or any particular form of art. We find later *nighanṭus* personifying various diseases-and bodily elements such as *vāta*, *pitta* *Kafa* etc. In the Mughal period, we know there were schools of paintings specializing the personifications of various *Rāgas* and *Rāginis*.

One may ask, how a formless object is given a form like this ? Obviously, sometimes there is a kind of pedantic and stereotype development, but at the root is the urge for form in human beings which personifies the unpersonified objects. A sort of personal or human relationship is emphasized with the formless objects in formulating various forms. The artists conceive a form for everything under the realization that without form nothing can exist-whether visual or non-visual. In the case of the *Rāgas* and *Rāginis* it is obvious that they are articulated in the terms of formal value as a theme or composition as a mood or a feeling.[34] The particular mood or feeling for the *gāyakī* of a Rāga is articulated in a visual image of its own. Similarly, the *grahas*, the *nakṣatras*, *rāśis* the are also given human forms. It is a sort of human desire for the exaltation of human form (which is the outcome of a long psychic process of birth and rebirth in various *yonis*, that he gives forms to everything around him whether visual (chākṣusī) or non visual (māansī). Actually it is his consciousness of the superiority of human form which makes himself conceive the incarnations in human forms. N. R. Ray puts it in this way :—

> "In the Indian tradition while men aspire to be gods or atleast godly in life, gods wanted to come down to the level of men and live with them.".[35]

Thus, the man's notion about the superiority of human form over all forms and his idea to attach sanctity to all forms-visual or non-visual related with human feelings, moods, actions and imaginations are responsible for the eruption of various divine entities in human form personifying various objects, ideas, attitudes, feelings and moods. Everything, which is around the 'man' is sanctified by man as a Divine object, hence, he conceives for every object a Divine form.

As a matter of fact nothing can be conceived without a visual or mental form. The 'form' is identity and the 'being' itself, In Indian concept form is derived out of the ultimate form and ultimate gole of 'Form' is to merge into ultimate form. The result of formlessness or the surrender of identity is 'supreme bliss'. But this idea itself is emphasised through 'form'. This is evident in the Brahmanical iconography in the form of Umā-Maheśvara and Rādhā Kṛṣṇa etc. Their embrace (āliṅgana) to each other or their merger into one as Ardhanāriśavara) or Mohini, a form of Viṣṇu, is actually the merger of duality of form into one infinite form. The *Tantric* representation of *Yab Yum*, popular in Nepal, Tibbet and China, in which : Ādibuddha, the Vajradhara, and the embodiment of five *skandhas-Rūpa*, *Vedanā*, *Saṁjñayā*, *Saṁskāra*, *Vijñāna* and also the symbol of *Śūnya*, embraces closely prajñāpārmitā, his Śakti to symbolize the merger of identities which is the source of supreme bliss (parama sukha). This *Paramasukka* or *Brahmānanda*, if experienced cannot be expressed in words. Same is about *Kavyānanda* which is actually *Brahmānanda sahodaraṁ*. But neither *Brahmānda* nor *ratyānanda* can be expresses in visual form and explained in the terms of human experiences. The *Tantrics* realized that *Paramāsukha* can be explained and experienced in the terms of *ratisukha* in which again their is complete merger of identity. So long the idea of non-duality of identity was on a sublime conceptual plane (dhyānagamya) the form was pure, and socially meaningful. But when the idea was adopted as a ritualistic practice (Kriyā of Sādhanā) in the hands of *Tāntrics* such as 'Kaula-Kāpāliks', the forms became vulgar as the result of socially vulgar practices. One may see non-duality of form in most formal manner in the art of Khajuraho.

Social relevancy and change affects the 'form' both conceptually as in its articulation. The primitive or archaic is the society; primitive is the belief the primitive is the form. Our pre-historic societies or traditionally archaic societies conceived mostly abstract form i. e. the form reduced to minimum linear composition according to their vague idea of the divinity. There is 'a sort of matter of fact represention of the supernatural with the seen'. The whole of Mauryan court art as we have noted earlier, represents impersonal form of Asokan ideology which itself is a sort of cultural grafting or a plant nurtured in the glass-house and that withered away as soon as the court patronage was withdrawn. But in folk art, cherished by people of the time of the Mauryans and the Śuṅgas a defferent sort of from based on earth-bound experiences were coming into being. The pre-Kuṣāṇa Yakṣas are the examples. But as in the post Mauryan period, despite the troubles and the turmoils of the disintegration of Mauryan Empire there was an intensive cultural mobility with dynamic achievements of intrinsic values in the field of art, letters, and socio-economic conditions, the form becomes fluid, dynamic and compact. Nature and Man come for the first time on the Indian art scene, joining hands, to represent the joy and auspiciousness of Nature and in human life. The reliefs of Bharhut, Sanchi, Bodhgaya, Amaravati suggests that the people and the sculptors had perfect understanding of the concepts of *lokamaṅgala*. In the next phase, in the Kuṣāṇa art, Man emerged in relations to Nature with his independent status, though his bodily form was still full with the life sap of the nature particularly from vegetation. The vegital attitude is very well expressed in the charming contour of the body and the face and its flexion (bhaṅgimās) of the figures.[36]

Greeco-Roman or Romano-Greek art, produced a marginal impact of Greek realism on the divine form of Buddha and Bodhisattva. It had some inspiring influence on the evolution of the Bodhi concept, no doubt, but Mathura sculptors had evolved by that time, (1st cent. A. D.) a distinct formula of presenting a divine image in a superhuman form. How a mortal frame can contain a Divine being ? Therefore they evolved the concept of super human being. All energies are concentrated in the super human figure, super human because, on the bases of actual appearance, its aspect is so modified as to suggest supernatural strength, freed from the encumbrances of earthly well-being. But the idea was modified in the Gupta or Classical Age through transubstantiation of the human form and naturalistic modelling. This age was the embodiment of all round success in various fields of culture, politics and witnessed an unprecedented artistic activity that gave birth to a national style of art distinguished by common characteristics.[37] As the result of this, there was an urge for universal human form to contain all divine ideals based on universal consciousness. We have mentioned the standarded form of a divine image in the Gupta Age. This form is not real like that of Greek icons based on masculine physical qualities, nor natural like that of Śuṅga Art, but academic, intellectually conceived which was bound to lead to the increasing prestige of sculptural form. This form is based on inner-experience of the energy of the formless or unformed (avyakta) in contrast to Mathura Bodhisattava image in which external form of energy is made manifest through the medium of human form. But the classical form was well balanced, full of rhythm and disciplined by *yoga* enshrining *prāṇa*.

In the succeeding phases of Indian art the cosmic ideology relating to to super being, which began in the Gupta period itself, needed a cosmic form This idea became manifest into the most dynamic and vigorous manner, symbolizing the passionate and violent struggle which the nation had against the attacks of the Islamic forces, together with internal strife in the early Mediaeval period. The tensed socio-political atmosphere, tensified the forms. The calm and poised attitudes of gods and goddesses were now changed into active attitudes, mostly crushing the demons and in some cases their sectarian rivals. The masses of the period greatly held by the panic of the time needed extra protection and assurance by the extra-hands holding a number of weapons and suggesting various gestures to their devotees. One may look into this change. In the Kuṣāṇa period there were some figures showing more than two hands except in cases of Viṣṇu and Mahiṣmardini. In the classical period when the dangers of the foreign invasion were increased but at the same time the nation was confident of security in the hands of the Imperial Guptas the hands of the gods and goddesses with a few exceptions hardly increased more than four. But in the early mediaeval period with the increased dangers to security, the number of hands normally increased from four to twenty, even more than thirty two·

The feudalistic structure of early Mediaeval state and society also had its bearing on the form of a divine image, particularly its compositional aspects. Emergence of new monarchies mostly claimed their divine or semi divine status or sanctified their theoritical origin by tracing their roots to divine figures, such as Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Sūrya, Chandra etc. The tendency to look a king as a god also resulted into a kind of conceptual change to see the God as a King. We find now gods and goddesses, even Buddha invariable shown with crown. Seated in the royal attitude (Lalitākṣepa or in Mahārājalilāsana) on the elegantly carved *āsana*, the back slab and the pedestal almost represening the scene of a royal court. The flying *Vidyādharas* with garlands or playing musical instruments represent the court, dancers and musicians. The damsels are also shown as attendents with graceful bodily flexion represent the *Kanyās* of the court. The attendents and *parikaras* having *chāmara* or *chhattra* in hands are the symbols of royality. Even, Jin figure are shown associated with the symbols of royality, Iconographic necessity of Jin image as indicated in the 'Rūpamaṇḍana' includes three umbrellas, musicians royal-throne, elephants and lions etc. as the symbols of royality. They are to be presented with not less than eight attendants (*aṣta parikars*). [38] The gods and the goddesses shown in princely attire, Avalokitiśvara and Prajñāpāramitā figures began to show on their pedestals the seven *ratnas*, wheel, horse, elephant, jewel. wife, household and commander—the symbols of royality.

Social relevancy of the form in Indian art is self evident. There is no denying the fact that there are examples of form relating to secular aspect of Indian life but as a whole the forms in Indian art are socially conditioned and functionally useful in relation to religion. The idea 'art for art sake' has no place in Indian art. The artist himself is socially conditioned and like his form-created, he himself believes in the merger of his identity into the social realities. Therefore the whole of traditional Indian art, allowing some cases as exceptions, is anonymous. The social reality is complexed reality and can be interpreted variously with changing notions. But two fundamental considerations were always relevant in Indian forms. First the form must be capable of bearing the meaning (artha) and conducting to the point of *rasa.* For this the form is conditioned by two more factors i. e. medium which is *śabda* and *chanda* i. e. *tālamāna* of Indian Iconometry. *Śabda* i. e. medium conditioned by *chanda* produces a form which has meaning (artha) and leads to *rasa.* Social good is the second condition and this was so important that for every form some merit is attached in the *Śilpatexts* and the *Sādhanā* texts. There is no form to be conceived without any social and religious merits. While deformity is a curse and should be avoided, a well formed image is sure to bring good and prosperity (Saukhyadaḥ). Thus, in the 'Rūpamaṇḍana' there is a warning against the deformed images and described as *dukhadāyikā.*[39] It has been suggested that wise should abandon such images. (Aṅgapratyaṅgabhagnaṁtu mūrtiṁ dhīmāna visarjayeta, etc).

At the same time for a particular people or merit or locality a particular form is also suggested. To take some examples of Vaiṣṇavite forms. Nārāyaṇa, Keśava Mādhava are good for the '*Brāhmanas*'. Madhusūdana for the *Kṣhatriyas* and Tṛvikrama as well as Vāmana for the *Vaiśyas*. The image of Śridhara brings prosperity to the *Sūdras* etc. The image of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa is for *bhukti* and *mukti*. Vaikunṭha for peace and Kārttikeya for the fulfilment of wishes, (Sarvakāmadaḥ) Every divine form is auspecious (Sarvadeva mayaḥ Śubhaḥ) Practically in every form and composition the idea of good, security and prosperity is indicated through the symbolism of hands. The poses *abhaya* and *varada* usually found with every divine form, even if representing the terrific aspect of the god, symbolises this very idea of security and protection. Besides, certain hand poses (mudrās) there came out certain forms providing the sense of security to the devotees. Thus we find Tṛvikarma, Varāha, the forms of Viṣṇu, various *saṁhāramūrties* of Śiva, Mahiṣmardinī or Kātyāyinī forms of śakti appeared more frequenty at the time when the masses needed to be assured and secured from the invading inroads of the '*Yavanas*', '*Śakas*', '*Hūṇas*' elc. form about the lst century A. D. It is not without the social relevancy that the majestic and vigorous figure of Ādivarāha appeared for the first time in the time of Chandragupta II at Udaigiri, thé place where he established the *skandhāvāra*, after defeating the '*Hunas*'. This place, as well as the image of Ādivarāha was at a strategic situation from where he, could control the command of Western India and provide internal security to Madhyadeśa, symbolised here in the form of Gaṅgā and Yamunā carved on the panel. The appearance of twelve handed Durgā at Udaigiri signifies the same truth.

References

1. *Tarka kaumudi*, quoted in Apte's *Sanskrit English Dictionary*, p. 471.
2. *Comparative Aesthetics*, vol. II p. 14.
3. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 14.
4. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 30.
5. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 11.
6. R. G. Callingwood, *Principles of Art*, pp. 23–24.
7. De Witt H. Parker, 'The Analysis of Art' Ch. II; *Problems of Aesthetics*, p. 203–209.
8. Irving Singer. '*Santayana's Aesthetics*' p. 146.
9. Giovanni Gullace, '*The Philosophy of Art*, p. 106.
10. G. Santayana, *The sense of Beauty*, pp. 56–62.
11. Ibid., pp. 61–62.
12. *Principles of Aesthetics*, p. 307.
13. Ibid., pp. 307–324.
14. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, vs. 624–625.
15. *Śilparatna*, IV, 145–146.
16. *Chitrasūtra*, 42. 48. Supra, p. 67.
17. Ibid., 41. 2 The text defines this in case of *Satya* class of painting. But in this context, the definition is considered merely as for 'true image'.
18. B. M. Barua. 'Ancient Indian Theories of Art'. *JISOA* Vol. I No. 2. pp. 83, 109–110; *An Approach to Indian Art* p. 67
19. *Transformation of Nature in Art* pp. 125–126.
20. '*Śukranīti*, IV. 4. 70–71.
21. *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, III. 2. 1. 5.
22. *An Approach to Indian Art*, p. 64.
23. *Transformation of Nature in Art*, pp. 125. *Supra* p. 39.
24. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, 48. 2–3,
25. Ibid., 48. 7
26. *Śṛtatavanidhi* Ch. V 507–517, vs. 465.
27. *Devimāhtmya*, V. 16–27.
28. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* ch. 42. 57.
29. *Varāha Purāṇa*, ch. V. 16–17.
30. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*. ch. 42. 57–58.
31. *Rūpamaṇḍana*. III. 24.

32. N. K. Sahu, *History of Buddhism in Orissa*, Fig. 67.
33. B. C. Bhattacharya. *Indian Buddhist Iconography*, pp. 323–328.
34. *An Approach to Indian Art*. p. 269.
35. Ibid., p. 265.
36. Stella Kramrich, *Indian Sculpture* p. 53–58.
37. V. S. Agrawala, *Gupta Art*, p. 1.
38. *Rūpamaṇḍana* Ch. VI. 33–39.
39. Ibid., Ch. I. 10–16.

VIII

The Concept of Beauty and Aesthetic Experience

Socrates laid the foundatson of speculation on 'beauty' which influenced the mind of the western theorists for considerably a long time. He considered beauty as a relative term and not the absolute one. To illustrate his view he said an arrow which is beautiful for shooting is not beautiful for saving oneself from the dart of an enemy. (Memorabila of Socrates III. ch. X) This example, as it appears, considered beauty in its functional and consequential relationship. He further considered 'beauty' in relation to good and lovely, and its ability to represent the passion of men and to excite pleasure in the spectator. To him the perfect imitation is the chief quality af beauty.

Plato added permanent value to aesthetics but mingled aesthetics with metaphysics. In his opinion the objective world is nothing but 'reflection' of the world of ideas on 'matter' and a product of art is but a reflection of natural objects. Ānandavardhana in 'Dhvanyāloka' cherished this idea and stated that the objective world is nothing but reflection. Reflection and imitation are the two significant elements of art and guiding principles to the imitative artists. Further, he did not plead pure imitation, comparable to 'copying'. He explained imitation of beauty in terms of illusion too. His aesthetics is subject to metaphysical and ethical values. He speculates about the 'world, of ideas, and 'matter' and when both inter-act the true reality of art exists. To him ideas are the essence of art and its forms. Since they inherit the common qualities; they have universal appeal too, though the idea is quantitavely innumerable. But the matter is secondary, the human soul is also imperfect, the matter receives the form only imperfectly. Thus, the beauty is matter as the result of imperfect idea of human soul, and is merely a partial resemblance of the 'world soul'. The object of senses are mere fleeting shadows of the eternal and unchanging ideas. They are of no real value. But despite the imperfection he pleaded the significance of beauty as an education, which leads the higher virtues determined by social justice. He and Plotinus, however boldly asserted that the 'arts do not simply imitate the visible thing but go back to the principles of nature (Republic, 500 c, 402 c and 473 a). He had replaced the theory of faithful imitation by selective imitation and introduced the conception of relative beauty. How this concept is near to Indian concepts of *sādṛiśyatā*, we have already noticed.[1] Further as imitation in terms of copying is not art so the beauty is not proportionate to edification.

Aristotleś ideas are not transcendent but immanent and universal, and such is the character of 'beauty'. He as the exponent of the moral purpose of art defined the aim of art as the moral improvement of the spectator, not through sermons but through effecting a 'Katharsis' of the emotions. This is in brief 'pedagogism', which though has universal appeal' also distinguishes the common feeling with that of individualist feeling particularly related with 'Katharsis', thus for 'the first time he discovers that art brings about the elimination of certain element of personality'.[2]

Aristotle did not ignore the physical and artistic meaning of the principle and identified moral virtues with the expression of the same law which we see in nature and art. Beauty is constituted by two elements physical and moral and they jointly cause all ideas of symmetry, proportion, balance, moderation and harmony. In relation to beauty and goodness he says that the keen aesthetic sensibility not only aims morality, but the procedure of aesthetic sensibility itself is moral. Kālidāsa in the 'Kumārasambhava' feels about the beauty similarly and says that *Yaduchyate Pārvati pāpavṛttaye na rupamitya vyabhichāritadvachaḥ*. Plotinus also sees beauty in virtues.

Art and beauty is admitted to be pleasant and the reason of our pleasure appears that the art imitates. But neither all imitations are true nor all pleasants are beautiful. All pleasurable things are not art, sometimes they are not only morally dangerous but also socially condemned.

Another element essential to creation of beauty, he considers, the intellectual virtue. To him art is one of the two hinds of virtue (1) moral, (2) intellectual. Art is thus not only the result of moral inspiration, but with or without this factor it is a creative activity under intellectual direction. The latter charactersitic is, as we have noted above, is the main objective of our '*Śilpasāstras* suggesting *lakṣaṇas* etc. This is necessary because if art aims at morality, the moral and intellectual injunctions are necessary, to avoid the art from becoming sensuous only.

Aristotle firmly held that in art presentation of things 'as they are' is not necessary, 'as they should be' is essential. The things in art are accepted not as they exist but as they are visualized by the intellect. This placed the concept of beauty on an idealized based. Therefore beauty is not merely perceptive but the result of mental receptibility. The beauty of art is also a means for the recollection of 'pure beauty' (Divine beauty). Due to limited perceptivility of 'separate (human) soul' in relation to 'absolute soul' while Plato sees beauty in 'appearance', Aristotle determines the source of beauty in 'imitation'.

Plotinus, however, was first in the tradition of Plato and Aristotle to theorize beauty as the positive attribute of art. Beauty as an aesthetic unit depended upon certain desirable qualities (of style) such as clearness, properiety, correctness, ornateness, lucidity, economy, fitness, freedom, force and compactness. Our ancient Indian theorists, as observed earlier, both in relation to poetics and *śilpa* discussed the merits and demirits of the art, more or less in the same way. Bharata has admitted ten qualities and ten defects[3] in *Kāvya* or in the performing arts and Bhāmaha reduced both the catagories to three, which was also acceptable to Mammaṭa and his followers.

The importance of Plotinus lies in the mystic explanation of aesthetic experience, which is not akin to usual level of pain and pleasure but the 'highest level of experience'. Since the 'phenomenal world is beautiful, beauty is at the both levels, spiritual and physical with difference in degrees. Experience of beauty depends upon the powers of soul, such as sensation, intellectual, imagination, recollection, contemplation etc. He has suggested the possibility of symbolic meaning of beauty and also has distinguished 'beautiful' from 'ugly',. The latter (ugly) is characterised by the situation when matter predominates over the form. As against this, the more the matter constituting an object of nature is moulded and ordered by spiritual form the more beautiful it is. Just as beauty is that property in things, which the soul recognizes as akin to her own essence, so ugly is that which is alien to her. The experience of beauty is mystic which is also the experience of 'One' and this experience cannot be expressed, though realisable in mystic ecstasy only, through communion with and absorption in it. This 'One' is the source and goal of beauty and its expereice. This idea finds its conformation with the Indian concept of

'Brahmāsvādana' through the artistic creation. Though 'One' is source and begining of 'beauty' it is not always beauty; the 'true' and 'good' are also the elemental aspect of 'One' and its experience. Thus, though he believed 'True', 'Good' and 'Beautiful' as the ultimate values to humanity—all are not inherent in the 'World of senses'. He defines the elemental aspect of beauty through successive logic. Beautiful forms in the physical world have a real resemblance to their arche-types of sptritual world. This has apparent analogy with the concept '*Jalechandramasaṁ* or *Jalachhāyā*. It is also nearer to *chitramayaṁ sarvaṁ paśyanti Brahmavādinaḥ*. Further, he suggests that beauty that we find in objects is not the subjective element, contributed by individual soul; it is not individual mind that gives 'meaning' to inert matter impressing forms upon it. Physical objects have beauty proportionate to their participation in form. The form combines and co-ordinates the parts, which make an unity and this unity is beautiful. But this beauty achieved in artistic form is inferior to the spiritual beauty, and perceivable to only aesthetic senses which are sight and hearing. The other senses are lower and un-aesthetic. Our theorists also favour to divide *kāvya* (art) into *dṛśya* and *śravya*, perceptible to sight and perceptible to hearing.

In relation to beauty, Plotinus defines art as a work that leads to the contemplation of the spiritual and is the product of artist's activity, which automatically acompanies his contemplation. Thus, art is symbolic representation of reality, as it figures in the vision of the artist, which itself is based on the underlying principles of the physical beauty. It is a form, externalized in a material medium. It is an entity of unity, hence beauty lies in part as well as in whole.

Very significantly Plotinus did not subordinate art to morality as Aristotle did and also he denied symmetry as identical to beauty. His predecessors agreed that symmetry is the essence of beauty. But he refused to identify beauty with symmetry and harmony. They are relevant to physical beauty, but the living force is more beautiful than dead. Beauty whether in nature or art has two aspects-sensible and intelligible and only first is relevant to aesthetic as it is the subject of hearing.[5] Just as in moral virtues there are three steps for the realization to god, there are three stepes for the realisation to beauty-love to natural beauty, looking into the truth and knowledge of likeness (like knows likeness). Recognizition of nature is thus recognization to beautiful.

But with all that about 'beauty', it remained subordinate to 'virtue'. Tolstoy was first to give a popular theory to art and beauty, neglecting the hedonistic speculation, defined art as the deleberate communication of feeling. 'It is a thing in itself but praiseworthy when those feelings are compatible with the good and end of life as conceived at that time.[6] Against this philosophic background he rationalized art that it should be intengible to the simplest peasant.[7] Therefore he defined the role of beauty to arise the feeling of admiration or disgust for an ugly one. In beauty he finds nothing higher than the sensual pleasure. Through beauty he expected that an artist will impart moral lessions. Moral justification to him is the basis for the judgment of 'beautiful'.

The moral effect of art, particularly in its directness, has been disputed by the subsequent writers on one hand and sometimes elaborated on the other. For example, Ruskin holds that the fine art has only three functions expressing the religious sentiments of men, perfecting their ethical state and doing them material service.[8] The second function is approved in Indian concept when art is considered as a factor 'which cultures the soul'[9] (ātmānaṁ cha saṁkurute).

To this view Hegel goes to say 'if art becomes one among other means of recommending good conduct, it is degraded and true morality is not thereby furthered'. To him Mind is higher than 'Nature' and therefore beauty of art is higher than the beauty of Nature. The works of art register 'Man's visions of beauty; A work of art is not mere nexus of lines, curves, forms, colours and kinds. Its value lies in the emotion or idea breathed into the work of art. The lustre of artis the lustre of the idea, breaking down the barrier of the medium or material illuminates it with its light. Thus, idea emerges in the shape of lustrious beauty. Beauty as Hegel interprets is the disclosure of Mind'.

But before Hegel, we will come to earlier theorists of the west, who flourished earlier.

From early Christian era to Middle age and upto Renaissance the speculations about beauty more or less was biased by the intellectualism of the age. St. Augustine considered false in relation to truth in other words ugly in relation to beauty. Ugly is considered to serve an important function for it brings beauty to prominance by contrast. In the Middle ages beauty is defined as the revelation of reason in sensuous form. The Renaissance theory provided possible departure to beauty from metaphysics and considered it as purely human invention. The cause of beautiful artistic production was determined in the human power, ability and choice to select the brightest parts from the best and loveliest featurrs of Nature. But this naturalism is not blind imitation of nature; it meant right interpretation of nature, which involves the use of all mental faculties from memory to contemplation. It was fusion of the naturalistic idea of art with that of harmonious design. Perspective anatomy and psychology as the factors of 'sense data determine the nature of imitation, which the Renaissance theorists described as 'verisimilitude' or rationalistic naturalism.,[10]

The great intelleculist Descartes considered the aesthetic experience of of beauty as an intellectual experience which is accompanied by three types of joy, sensuous, imaginative and emotive. Further, he maintained that beauty is experienced and represented by external senses, particularly the sight, but good of beauty is determined by reason. As against this Locke rejects beauty as unreal and the result of complex idea. Addition, the British theorists, considered the nature of beauty as the result of idealized imitation, yet a power ful factor to stir our emotions. Pleasure or pain are the direct derivatives of artistic creation. However, it has a reflect action which ultimately transforms both into aesthetic delight. This view is comparable with the concept indicated earlier relating to the experience of the *lokatṭara* type or what is explained as *vigalitvedyāntaraṁ* etc.[11] Further he says that beauty is a product of art or nature, consists in the gaiety or variety of colours, in symmetry and harmony of parts or in just mixture of all. We have noted that in the Vedic concept of art there is also the distinction of beauty in reference to *Śilpa*–Divine and human (daivi and mānuṣī).[12] He also shows that symmetry etc. are not beautiful in themselves, but in relation to 'Mind'.[13] Berkeley explains that that beauty is nothing but symmetry and proportion in relation to the use of object lookd upon as beautiful. It is felt but not without the cooperation of reason. He assigns beauty to perfection and in whole. To him Divine is the source of beauty. But Hume takes a depart with the British theoriests and makes distinction between impression and idea in relation to sense of reality. To him imagination is also not arbitrary but based on certain beliefs in which there is consistency and coherence. Being utilitarian rationalist, he proposed that beauty is not the product of rules, but the inspiration of genius' Our theorists also contribute to this view and say that inspite the rules, the beauty is the realm of *vicchakṣaṇa*. Considering beauty as a complex idea he simplifies that beauty is such an order or construction of parts as (1) by primary constitution of human nature (2) by custom and its ability to provide pleasure and satisfaction. Ugly is the antithesis of beauty consisting deformity and pain. The perfect beauty is, which is in relation and its form is perceptable to senses. Beauty, thus as represented in images, is not true 'and not universal also. Its realisation is individualistic; who is perceptable to sense of beauty, comparable to *sahṛdaya* of Indian concept. The theory of taste and social passion of Burk referring to curiosity, sympathy, imitation, ambition, grief, love, terror, astonishment are very much akin to *sthāyībhāvas* of Indian poetics. He has also posed the problem of 'beauty' in relation to 'sublime'. The element of delight is in both, but power of generating strongest emotion, excited by object and its elements such as greatness, height, infinity, magnitude is in sublime. To take one example from the Indian theory of painting : it can be said while *rekhā* and *vartnā* are the elements of 'beauty', *varṇāḍhyaṁ* is the element of 'sublime'. Kant developed theory of 'sublime' from the point of view of aesthetic judgement and finds in them similarity as well as difference. Thus the similarities in both are that both please in them selves, they are not logical but simply reflective and arise sensuous satisfaction both are related to limitless form; beauty is subject to indefinite concept of understanding, sublime presents indefinite idea of reason to the extent of mathemetical calculation; beauty is related with quality, sublime is related with quantity; in beauty pleasure is spontaneous and direct but in sublime it is mostly indirect, and inspires admiration or respect or even astonishment, but not the positive pleasure. The beautiful in nature, exhibits purposiveness in its form and thus seems to be preadapted to our judgement[14] and is therefore, in itself the object of satisfaction. But the sublime in nature seems to violate the principle of purposiveness in its form and therefore it is ill adapted to our faculty of judgement; it does violence to imagination. Sublime is 'Absolutely great' not subject to understanding, sense or even to reason. The 'Absolute totality' is a mixed feeling of pleasure and pain.

Baumgarten in reletion to imitation propounded that the world is perfect to the greatest degree and the nature of world is accessible to sense perception. Nature contains the greatest variety of forms, imitation is not mere coxying, but elimination of what is out of harmony as such an imitation of nature is the law of art and clue to beauty. Beauty and Truth, both are subjective for the reason that both are 'felt harmony and felt perfection'.

The absolutist, Hegel neglects nature as strictly beautiful and declared that all beauty whether natural or artistic is the product of the human mind. For him art is the presentation of truth or spiritual reality in sensuous form. Truth, however, is revealed in better way by religion and philosophy. Artistic beauty is reflection of idea explicit to sensible. The beauty must be sensuous (his idea of expression is akin to the expression of *dhvanivādis* of Indian poetics). The expression of beauty, however, lies in the unity of spiritual and natural idea through the concrete and real shape. This unity of expression also can be compared with the *lokottara* sensibility. Hegel has logically confirmed that the real truth of beauty, which is higher and divine is reflected in the art and is the shadow of the higher truth.[15] Further he says that the nature of beauty, the ideal of all arts, consists, in the knowledge of reality and of its concept, not separate and in abstraction as they remain for the inartistic consciousness, but immediately fused. The beautiful object is self-contained; it does not stand over against something else as means to an end, object to a subject, necessity to accidents, whole to parts; all these abstract oppositions are overcome.[16] The central idea of Hegel about beauty is that it is the disclosure of mind or the idea through sensuous forms or media. He distinguishes art from beauty and says that art is simply a stage, the 'Absolute spirit' in its onward march to realization of the true infinity in philosophic spirit and beauty is the 'Absolute' as it shines through the veil of the sense world.[17]

Benedetto Croce, who considered 'beauty' 'with successful expression in its positive value'. He expressed this 'positive value' through several denominations such as 'beautiful', 'true'. 'good', 'useful', 'expedient'. 'right' etc. Negation of the values characterised by 'false', 'bad', 'useless', 'inexpedient', 'unjust', 'wrong', is 'ugly'.[18] As a matter of fact Croce was not very much inclined to use the term 'beautiful' but contained that beauty is the expression of intitution; and aesthetic pleasure is caused by the successful expression of beauty. The beauty of nature is the discovery of the human imagination hence, he attaches great values to human feelings, which is affirmed by art as the manifestation of the personality of artist himself.

When he uses the phrases such as 'scientific truth' it does not necessarily means moral. He discussed art is neither moral nor scientific. To him the phrases like intellectual beauty, moral beauty are also the vague terms.[19]

So far we were looking into the speculations about beauty by the western theorists, giving hints to Indian similar thinking about the beauty. The Vedic theorists expressed the sense of beauty in terms of *Vāma* and *Chārutā.*[20] *Vāma*, as the contexts shows, refers to physical beauty and *Chārutva* is more an inherent quality of art which absorbs the sense into itself. Such as in the western concepts, in India too beauty is viewed from different points of view. As physical fact beauty lies in symmetry, balance, proportion, order and rhythm. But in Indian concepts it is mingled with the concept of meaning. The two elements of beauty are generally ascribed - one word (form) and the other meaning (vāgartha). Some time the secret of beauty lies in unity as well as in diversity creating a situation for suggestion (dhvani). The meaning (artha) is relevant to expression. Thus Santayana has rightly observed that sense of beauty can be derived on three elements - form, medium and expression.[21] Our theorists have greatly discussed the medium of art, whether word or matter. Suitability of matter in relation to form has been the fasinating topic of discussion in most of the canonical thinking. Considering one example of 'Rūpamaṇḍana' (ch. I); it not only discusses the suitability of matter contributing a good image in relation to beauty, but also has pointed the defects of material which should be avoided at all costs. Matter and form are explicit in the expression of beauty. Our poetic theorists therefore investigated much in relation to expression (abhivyakti), through which the beauty is experienced. The beauty, according to our theorists, lies in the joy of creation and its passionate realization. The creation of beauty depends on the idea, deftness and delecacy. Beauty is unity.

Therefore, no pin-point factor can be assigned as beautiful. Kālidāsa has beautifully pointed this aspect of beauty, at the same time warned that beauty is not a matter of investigation (tattvānveṣaṇa). He describes the situation when a bee pursues Śakuntalā in search of beauty. He says 'You touch often the tremulous eyes (chapalāṅgadrṣtiṁ) whose side-long glances are so quick and chageful. You soar near her ears and sound sweetly there as if you whisper secrets of love in her ears (rahasyākhyāeva svanasi mṛdu karṇāntikacharaḥ). You taste her lips, which contain the quintessence of amorous delights, despite her depreciating hands (karau vyādhunvatyāḥ pivasi ratisarvasvamadhuraṁ). O honey-maker (madhukaraḥ) we are undone by our search a bout the search of things (of beauty). You are the happy being as you seek bliss in preference to knowledge.

Here Kālidāsa hints to a secret that it is good to feel beauty rather than to understand or investigate beauty through knowledge.

The true beauty according to Indian concept never perishes. In relation to poetic beauty, as is said in 'Chitramīmāṁsā' of Appaya, Dikshita it neither dies nor decays (na mamāra na jīryate). Rather it is ever fresh. Kālidāsa saya 'the very essence of beauty lies in its power of revealing new aspects every instant and holding our attention and admiration by ever-new attractiveness (Kṣaṇe kṣane yannavatāmupaiti tadaiva rūpaṁ ramaṇīyatāyaḥ). This experience of beauty is akin to the beauty and its experience of Divine. In the 'Gitā' it is said that the singing of glory of God is the revealing of ever-new and ever-radiant beauty, (tadaivā ramyaṁ ruchiraṁ navainnavṁ).

The Indian concept of beauty is expressed mostly as the total elemental sum of beauly by the terms 'saundarya 'ramaṇīyatā', 'śobhā', and 'chārutā'. All these refer to three elements of beauty i. e., beautiful, attraction and lovely Vālmīki adds 'dyuti' (brightness) 'samavibhaktāṅgatā' (proportionate body) 'snigdhtā' (facinating colour and smoothness) and 'śubhalakṣaṇa' (auspicious expressiveness'. To sum up, Indian aesthetics has especially stressed ·the above elements into three notes - the element of ever new self revelation, the element of reminiscence of anti-natal experience, enjoyment and expression, and the element of kinship to the supreme and eternal and infinite beauty of God.

We have considered earlier the merits and demerits of different forms of Indian art, particularly, the *ṣaḍaṅga* theory.[22] Merits must be incorporated and defects should be possibly avoided. The elements of art and painting as described in the 'Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra' and in the *Ṣaḍaṅga* theory-from *rūpabheda*, *pramāṇa* to *sādṛśya*, and *varṇikābhaṅga* as observed earlier, are relevant to 'form'. But 'beauty' lies in '*bhāva*' and '*lāvaṇya*'. *Bhāva* is inherent and fundamental to constitute beauty as *artha* is material in art and inexperienee of beauty. *Lāvaṇya* (grace) is the key-note of beauty. which is brought in art object through genius. It is brought in to art-object (yojanaṁ). *Lāvaṇya* is the secret of beauty and only a few are versed in the skill of *lāvaṇya-yojanaṁ*. *Lāvaṇya* (grace) is *prāṇa* without which the beauty is dead (mṛta). We have noted how the 'Chitrasūtra' gives emphasis on the distinction of an art object which is *Chetanāyukta* and which is *mṛta*, though both have form.[23]

The Īśvarasṁhitā, however distinguishes between *saundarya* and *lāvaṇya*. To this 'Pañcharātra' text *saundarya* is indespensible and it has positive relationship with form explicit through proportion and harmony. But *lāvaṇya* is an independent entity by way of expression of the inner mind, thought and feeling. It depends upon the mental visualization of image. This suggests to stages in creation of beauty. In the first stage the artist creates 'likeness' (sādṛśyatā) or outer expression. In the second stage the grace (lāvaṇya) is incorporated which is the expression of inner vision and the 'ideal'. The grace and beauty largely depend upon the relationship of 'idea' and 'image' the 'form' and 'expression'. But the formal qualities of image constituting 'beauty' depend upon the drammatic qualities of form characterised by glances (to suggest the various emotive situations and mind), *mudrā* (gestures as the external expression of mind) *sthānas* and *bhaṅgimās* (to suggest the bodily grace and actional suggestivness of the image and his mind). Various glances, bodily gestures, hind poses, positions of fingers, inclination of feet and bodily bent collectively not only indicate the physical attitude and beauty but also the inner mind. In a way, beauty is an inter-play of mind and idea, form and expression. Beauty is not something external, but it is spiritual and identical with the formative and creative spirit of the inner intution. The process of such transformation of mental image in to the external figure of beauty can be determined as follows :[24]—

Firstly, the artist must carefully observe all natural form and its beauty.

Secondly, he must be able to observe carefully the mutual proportions and harmonies.

Thirdly, he must be able to observe an object apart from the environment and must be able to note the difference produced thereby.

Fourthly, he must train his memory in such a manner that the observations of the past may easily, corectly and spontaneously be brought before the conscious plane.

Fifthly, he must train his eyes and his fingures to express in terms of artistic language of lines, colours, plastic forms the mental image that seeks expression.

Sixthly, he must be able to plunge into the meditation and contemplation so that in the depth of his mind he may feel the concrete touch of the objects of his representation that his whole personality, his joy and his will may be interfused with his creation in a concrete manner so that he may gradually give external form to his concrete reality held within his mind.

Seventhly, the artists mind must comprehened the true meaning of art and beauty.

The above is the suggested process of visualizing beauty in the art object.

But in realizing beauty there is also the question of preference. We have already noted how in relation to painting the different elements, such as *rekhā*, *vartanā*, *bhūṣaṇa* and *varṇāḍhyatā* as prefered for beauty by the men of different abilities and nature.[25] The same has happened in the case of Indian poetics. Considering in terms of beauty as the soul (ātmā) of poetry, (art) there are divergent views. The 'Vyaktiviveka' determines the source of art (poetic art) and beauty the three, *loka*, *veda* and *adhyātma*. Here he hints that beauty does not lie in certain physical fact but in the total expression of art with the relevance to *loka*, *veda* and *adhyātma*. But he himself gives emphasis on *lokavṛttānukarṇaṁ* which is very much in the conformity with the principles of similitude as noted in the 'Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa' which defines art as *trailkyānukārṇaṁ*. In the 'Nāṭyaśāstra' also *lokavṛttānukarṇaṁ* is preferred for the reason that it represents various emotions (nānābhāva) and different stages of life (nānā-avasthā). Mammaṭa rightly observes (Kāvya Prakāśa, I) that the distinction of Divine beauty (in nature) and artistic beauty is in the fact that the latter is the creation of *Kavi*. That means in aesthetic;the beauty is to be seen only in the human creation. In the 'Kāvyālaṁkāra', (I.14). Bhāmaha indicates the two aims of art—elevation (abhyudaya) and praise (stuti). The beauty should be sought for in the former. Therefore the most of views see the beauty in perfection of art. The 'Dhvanyāloka' (III) refers that the perfection is in avoiding the irrelevant and ordinary anecdotes. Due to human weaknesses man acts sometime irrelevant. The poet should avoid what the author calls *avyatpattikṛtadoṣaḥ* The perfection of poet (artist) lies in possible avoidance of this defects (śaktyā saṁvṛyate kaveḥ). This brings the problem of *auchitya*. Propriety (auchitya) does not aim at history (vṛttamātra or matter of fact representation) nor the matter of fact imitation. In both the modification in relation to aesthetic situation is necessary and in that lies the beauty. The problem of *auchitya* is related with *kṛtyākṛitya vichāra* i. e. the artist's judgement what to do and what not to do. Following these general principles, the artist may constitute beauty and for this he must seek the guidance of the *Śāstras*.

These general principles also indicate that the beauty lies in meaning and expression. Considering the analogy of 'kāvyasya śabdārthau śarīraṁ' Rājaśekhara hints that beauty in art lies in 'form' and 'meaning'. In the 'Sāhityadarpaṇa' the Kāvyaśarīra' is beautifully explained—*rasa* is the soul (rasādiśchātmā) *guṇa* is inherent quality (guṇaḥ śauryādi) *rīti* is anatomy (rītiyoścha avayava saṁsthāna) and *alaṁkāra* is the ornament on the 'Kāvya-śarīra' (alaṁkāraḥ kaṭaka kuṇḍalavit). An artist who considers all these elements of beauty is liable to enjoy the praise (kīrti) says Bhoja in his 'Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa' (nirdoṣa guṇavat kavyālaṁkāra rasairalaṁkṛtaṁ rasavantīṁ kaviḥ kurvan kīrti).

Kṣhemendra relates *auchitya* with *chamatkāra*, which is more admiration than surprise. In it lies the charm of expression also. The 'Bhāminīvilāsa' considers *chamatkāra* as the essence of poetry (cheteśchamatkṛtapadaṁ kavitevaramyā. 3. 1) and it is which says 'tadapekṣayā vāchaśchaiva chamatkāritvāt (Kāvya prakaśa I). But whether *auchitya* (agreeable, pleasentness or beautiful) or with any similar term such as *sundara, śobhā* etc. either vaguely understood or given highest praise to the extent that it is the soul of art. Thus Viśvanātha says *rase rāraśchamatkāraḥ sarvatra anūbhūyate.* And it is *chamatkāra* which makes an art a thing of unworldy beauty and experience (lokattara chamatkāra prāṇaḥ). Quite naturally as Viśvanātha conceives, this *lokattara chamatkāraprāṇa* (kāvya or art) with reference to beauty and its experience is arising from the exaltation of the *sattvaguṇa* (sattvodreka) infinite (akhaṅda) and full of self-luminous bliss and consciousness (prakāśānanda chinmayaḥ) which is free from the taint of any other intruding mental act, which is akin to the experience of Divine Bliss (vedyāntara sparsaśunyo, Brahmānanda sahodaraḥ). What is *chamatakāra* is also the *vaichitrya.*

Whether *chamatkāra* or *chārutā* can be produced in the normal expression (svabhāvokti) or in the obliqueness of speech (vakrokti). Facinating indirectness is considered as the soul of poetic beauty and it is implied in a hightened, striking and charming turn of phrase (form) and idea. Bhāmaha and lastly Kuntala gave highest tribute to *Vakrokti.*

Vakrokti, presents beauty in the mode of expression. It is defined as 'atiśayini vichitra ukti' 'prasiddhabhidhāna vaytirekini' or as 'vidgdha bhaṅgī'. After Kuntala (c. 1000 A. D.) its essentiality was discorded, probably on the ground that sometimes it leads to entire loss of touch with directness and reality of things.

The next possiblility is of *dhvani* as the soul of beauty (kāvyasyātmā dhvaniḥ). Ānandavardhana, defines *dhvani* as 'vyaṅgyatve na sākṣāt śabda vāchattve. The beauty is not-constitued by the literal meaning (abhidhā) nor by the secondary meaning (lakṣaṇā), but in the suggested meaning (vyañjanā). Such theorists always see beauty (chārutva) in the non manifest or indirect (anabhidheyatā). Since the beauty is a complex idea, the *dhvani* theorists made their theory comprehensive enough to incorporate the elements of beauty in all possible ways. They indicate *vastudhvani* to incorporate beauty in thought and form, *alaṁkāra dhvani* to incorporate the external embelishment and *rasa dhvani* to incorporate the beauty in expression and experience or the suggested aesthetic and emotional mood. The last is the highest of all. The beauty of *dhvani* is always *pratīyamāna* (suggestion) not in the *vāchya* (expression).

Under the concept that perfection is beauty Vāmana and Daṅḍin declared style as the soul of art (ritirātmā kāvyasya). *Rīti* added with *guṇas* present the beauty in perfect form.

Abhinavagupta pleaded *rasa* as the soul of beauty. His concept persisted for a long time and Viśvanātha very clearly stated that 'vākyaṁ rasātmakaṁ kāvyaṁ'. Abhinavagupta, however made it clear that *rasa* in terms of beauty is the object itself and not the subject. It is a direct feeling derived through a process of *vibhāvādi* and the realization of beauty is perfect when a *sahṛdaya* finds the manifestation of his own beauty (which he calls 'anurañjit sva') reflected in an artistic creation. Later theorists took it for *lokottara* experience. This *lokottara* is merely extra-ordinary and not unworldly. He subordinated *dhvani*, *guṇa*, *rīti* etc. to the aesthetic experience of beauty in terms of *rasa* or *rasānubhuti*.

But Bhāmaha and Daṅḍin considered *rasa* merely a figure of speech i. e. *rasavat*. Vāmana, without any reservation declared *alaṁkara* as the soul of beauty. He emphasized the significance of *guṇas* but also declared that *alaṁkāra* is the beauty (saundaryaṁ alaṁkāraḥ). Daṅḍin, in general agreed that *alaṁkāra* causes beauty (Kāvyādarśa, 2. 1). Vāmana also says '*alaṁkara* as 'Kāvya śobhā kartāraḥ' and it is with special purpose (atisayahetvaḥ) in art. (Kavyalaṁkārasūtra, 3. 1. 1–2).

Jagannātha took a compromising view to the problem of beauty in terms of *ramaṇīya* and in relation to poetics said beauty consists of words embodying a charming idea. (Ramaṇīyārthapratipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyaṁ). Thus he suggests that beauty lies in the form as well as meaning.

Aesthetic experience, which is the source of joy is the most significant aspect of art. The nature of aesthetic experience, however is of very complex and can be derived from multiple factors, basically three–*vastu*, *alaṁkāra* and *rasa*. The *vastu* is related with new knowledge or the acquaintance of a subject which constitutes a situation for aesthetic enjoyment. The *alaṁkara* is related with astonishment or strickingly charming and *rasa* leads to bliss. In the state of bliss the knowledge of *vastu* and the feeling of *chamatkāra* wither away and the experience itself became unexplicit. *Vastu* and *alaṁkara* became the constituents of *rasa* (rasamayaṁ sarvameva tatpratibhāsate, Dhvanyāloka. III). Ānandavardhana giving due recognition to *vastu* and *alaṁkāra* makes it clear that either of the two alone is not fully qualified to become the source of aesthetic experience and joy. The alternate proposition in relation to experience as stated above is of *dhvani*, which is derived through a peculiar process of suggestion (vyañjanā). Experience in ordinary level is perceptable to all senses (indriyagamya) but in art only two senses–the sense of hearing and the sense of seeing are material. But in visual arts other modes of expressions also have purpose. The meanings expressed by *abhidhā* or *lakṣanā* amounting to the realm of secondary meaning is not altogether out of realm of artistic experience, particularly in imagery, where *vastu* itself has a significant expression. Indentification with 'matter of fact' (vastu) is the very first step of realization and the other values of art rather intesifying ingredients of realization leading to aesthetic joy.

The 'Chitrasūtra' of 'Viṣṇūdharmottra' (III. 41. 11) has determined the levels of experience in four realistic planes, particularly with reference to painting. *Āchāryas* (masters) admiring lines (rekhā), *Viccksaṇa* (connoisseurs) praise modelling and excellence in shading (vartnā) *Stri*, the people of feminine taste ornamentation and decorative work (bhūṣaṇa) and *itarajana*, the people of low level or the general people the colouring (varṇādhyaṁ). The suggestion in this statement is that a work of art has something to please everybody. Therefore the experience derived either by way of direct statement or alternate meaning or suggested meaning is significant. The universal appeal of art, in canonical theorics is confined to *sahṛdaya*, who has special apptitude for experience. Abhinavagupta, commenting on 'Dhvanyāloka' .explains that the connoisseur (sahṛdaya) participates in thc consensus of mind and is one who has perceived the natural appropriateness of what is represented. His mind has become lucidly receptive like a mirror, through effort and constant practice of poetry of experiencing art. He is the authority whose mind is capable of reception and flawless imagination or capacity of absorption in the artistic creation. The theorists lay emphasis on special apptitude and inclination for the reason that aesthetic experience is not an objective entity and it depends on the person's own capacity to enjoy the artistic creation. Dhanañjaya in

'Daśarūpaka' says that a degree of culture and aesthetic instinct is demanded in the critic, the *rasika*, the *sahṛdaya*, who is the *adhikārin* (authority or compitent person) to experience the art. Under this situation *sahṛdaya* holds an extra-ordinary position. All men are equal so far physical qualities are concerned (akṣuṇavantaḥ karṇavantaḥ sakhāyaḥ). But the distinction of a *sahdṛaya* with a commoner is the sentiment, which is not in equal level in all the men (manojavaṁ asamābabhūvuḥ).[26] This sentimental and emotional apptitude and capacity is not spontaneous, but flows in a very congenial and desired situation. Abhinavagupta commenting on 'Nāṭyaśāstra'[27] assumes certain obstacles (vighna) in the way of aesthetic experience or obstacle to sympathetic cognition. They are lack of imagination, pre-disposition, lack of interest, lack of experience, unfamiliarity with the language (symbolism and meaning), portrayal of some trifling matter which does not concern the universality of human experience, confusion as to the emotion being portrayed etc. At the same time the expression (*abhivyakti*) should also be noble and clear. Under the referential theory of *dhvani* the expression should not be mere denotation (abhidhā), nor import (tātparya), indication (lakṣanā), perception (pratyakṣa), inference (anumāna), reminiscence (smaraṇa) etc. but explicity characterized by suggestion (vyañjanā). It is a sort of situation in which the obstacles not only in expression but also in experience are removed (vīṭavighnapratīti). This state of experience provides a distinct realization forced from all doubts and obstacles and awakens the artistic charm (chamatkāraniveśa), which alone is sometimes considered as the soul of expression and is universally experienced (chamatkārasāratve and sarvatranubhūyete, Dhvanyāloka III. 37). From the aesthetic point of view the success and failure of expression may also be termed as beauty and ugliness for the beautiful is considered also as the perfect expression. Flawless and imperfect_expression does not mean an expression which has *doṣas* as enummerated in poetics in relation to poetry and in the *śilpasātras* in relation to painting and imagery. but also that the expression should also have its possible constituents enummerated under *guṇas*, *alaṁkāras*, *rītis* and in the confirmity of *deśadharma* (local usage). The three factors, however, are significant in expression. The most important among the three is the mode of expression. It is infinitive and diversified in accordance with the individual (poet or artist). The expression is not mechanical but an organic whole in relation to the artistic intutson. The artistic expression cannot be made confined to certain prescriptitions or canonical and iconographic *lakṣaṇas*, but the individual expression automatically selects its own appropriate qualities. In poetics Kuntaka has noted that the concept or *riti*, *guṇa* and *alaṁkāra* can be justified only if they are related to the *kavikarma* or *kavisvabhāva.*[28] Similarly in the artistic expression the qualities *lakṣana* the style etc, as the elements of expression, rather mode of expression must be in the conformity with the nature and imagination, and execution of art by the artist which is naturally akin to *kavikarma* and *kavisvabhāva.*

The mode of expression (form) must be in the seemingness with the content (kathya or pratipādya). The content or the subject-matter also can be infinite, and the artist is free to a liberal extent to choose the content, on the theoretical plane as he is the sole master of everything in the infinite world of art (apāre kāvyasaṁsāre kavieva prajāpatiḥ, yathāvai rochayate viśvaṁ tathaiva parivartate 'Agni Purāṇā 336-10). But in the case of imagery and painting the canonical prescriptions played a significant role in defining and determining the content. The form and content both were conditioned by *deśadharma.* If the two elements of expression that is mode and content are perfect the third element, impression, is the logical out come of the first two. Impression (prabhāva) is the spontaneous effect of an expression and the aesthetic impression is not only the basis for the determination of the validity of art, but also the criteria for he aesthetic judgement. The aesthetic judgement is not based merely either on the mode of expression or the content of art, but considering them as constituents, it depends upon the total impact and its intensity on the *sahṛdaya* or *vicchakṣaṇa.* The aesthetic impact is the source of aesthetic experience.

The question is raised about the abode of experience. Whether the object of art, or the artist or *rasika* or *sahṛdaya.* The feelings and emotions evoked by the work of art is certainly 'transpersonal'. The term 'transpersonal' has special significance for the reason that what the spectator experiences is a distant experience, but based on actual life and intimately related with personal experiences. The taste of the art work is due to a recollection and a revival of one's own experience as afforded by the art medium. In such art experiences actually he re-lives. Feeling the distance between the art object and his own self, he deleberately re-lives by way of self-identification with the imagined situation, devoid of any relation with the limited self as it were impersonal. Dhanañjaya illustrates this problem (Vyaktiviveka, IV, 41–42) by stating that as the boys while playing with terracotta elephants enjoy their own passion (utsāha). In the case of drama he says that the performer (nartaka or pātra) does not relish the artistic experience (kāvya-bhāvanā). Abhinavagupta also holds the similar view and says that the pot containing the honey is not able to taste the sweetness of the honey, so is the case of the performer or the artist. The object and the artists are the means stumili of the experience. The *rasavādins* are firm in exclusion of artist and the art objects from the realm of experience. They constitute causes. There is *bhāvakabhāva saṁbandha*[29] in the art object and the artist. *Kāvya,* the artistic creation is *bhāvaka* and the experience (rasa) is *bhāvya*[30] which is experienced and enjoyed by the *rasika* (rasike rasaḥ). The word and meaning (kāvyārtha) is embodied in the *rasika* (rasikavartī). The joy which the *rasika* feels is not derived but inherent in him and actually in the contact of art he enjoys his own self (kavyārtha sambhedādātmānanda samudbhavaḥ, (Daśarūpaka, IV. 43). Abhinavagupta maens *rasa* synonymus with the re-living (with the art object) and says 'it is nothing but the tasting of ones consciousness'. Dhanañjaya makes it clear by stating '*sotsāha svadate*' (IV. 4. 14). The *sahṛdaya* or *raīska* tastes or experiences his own emotions. But the entity of art object is not the negative entity. It embodies the idea in the garb of beauty and the idea of art itself is the fact of imagination or the actual model, living or otherwise to be formulated by the artist and expressed through the material medium (object) beautifully. Thus through art medium, which is the fact of idea and imagination of the artist reflects into the mind of the *rasika* causing the fact of experience into him. This view, is substantiated by the view of Bharata in his 'Nāṭyaśāstra' (Vol. I. ch. 6 p. 288) who answers the question '*rasa* (aesthetic experience) *iti kaḥ* by mentioning *padārtha* (matter of fact of art itself). The *kāvyārtha* is carried meaning of Abhinavagupta of the right word *padārtha,* though both can be enjoyed or tasted (asvāda) or for taste (asvādya), the experience is objective (embodied in the art object) but the experience is always subjective, because it is individual *rasika* who cherishes the experience of emotions. The art object by its special characteristic (guṇadharma) has an appeal to the *rasika*. In the process of *asvādana* (experience) the senses (indriya sannikarśa) plays a significent role but ultimately it is the *manas* which is effected by the experience. (āsvādayanti mansā, Nāṭya Śāstra VI. 33).

It is *mansa* which is receptive due to its own emotions (manojvṁ = bhāvas). Here comes the problem of *bhāvas*. The experiences are countless but it is a matter of exclusive credit to the Indian theorists who have catagorized and specified the emotions (bhāvas) in the context of *rasa* which is the most positive theory in relation to the aesthetic experience.

Traditionaly, Nandikeśvara is mentioned as the first propounder of *rasa* theory; but for all practical purposes, Bharata is rightly regarded as the master of the concept. He has dealt with the problem of *rasa* and emotions (bhāvas) in the 'Nāṭyaśāstra'[31]. He has presented the problems in a very scientific manner and has never exalted the level of aesthetic experience comparable with the metaphysical experience or joy such as 'brahmānanda'. To him the aesthetic experience is comparable with the worldly experience resulted by the tasting of a cooked food. (yathā hi nānā vyañjana sanskṛtmannaṁ bhuñjānā rasānāsvādayanti sumanasaḥ)[32] He explicitly mentions that the aesthetic experience in the form of *rasa* is tasted by ones own self, which actually and already is present in the heart or mind (manas) of the *rasika* in the form of permanent moods (sthāyībhāvas). According to the nature of mind (chittavṛtti) there are four behavioural stages—*vikāsa* (blossomings), *vistāra* (expansion) *kṣobha* (agitation) and *vikṣepa* (unsettlement) which in relation to the aesthetic experience appear as *rati*, *utsāha*, *krodha* and *jugupsā*. They lead to four sentiments *śṛṅgāra*, *vīra*, *vībhatsa* and *raudra*. The sub varieties of the above four constitute eight permanent moods (sthāyībhāvas)–i. e. *rati* (delight), *hāsa* (laughter), *śoka* (sorrow), *krodha* (anger), *utsāha* (heroism), *bhaya* (fear), *jugupsā* (disgust) and *viśmaya* (astonishment) through the contact of secondary emotions such as *anubhāva*. and *vyabhichārībhāva* produce the eight *rāsa*, the eight fold aesthetic experiences (vibhāvanubhāva vyabhichārisañjogādrasanişpattiḥ, Nāṭyaśāstra.) Bharata has not clearly mentioned the ninth *rasa*, which is *śāntarasa*, probably because *śānta* is the ultimate resultant effect of all other eight *rasas* (bhavavikāra ratyādyaḥ śāntastuprakrtiramataḥ N. S. p. 338), namely *śṛngara*, (love) *hāsya* (comic), *karuṇā* (pathos) *raudra* (fury). *vīra* (heroism), *bhayānaka* (disgust) and *adbhuta* (marvellous). Kālidāsa in the 'Vikramorvaśīyaṁ' refers to eight *rasas* as 'aṣtarasāsrayao' (I. 18). Bharata though clearly mentions 'ete hyeṣtau rasaḥ proktā' ultimately in the sixth chapters discusses the *śāntarasa* and ultimately concluedes *'eram navarasa dṛṣtā.'* Rudraṭa in his 'Kavyālaṁkāra' not only includes *śānta* as the ninth *rasa* but adds to it the tenth *rasa* in the name of *preyas* (friendship). The *sthāyībhavas* of these *rasas* are *sama* or *nirveda* (dispassion) and *sneha* and he has pleaded successfully that these permanent emotions have the capacity to come up as *rasa*. (Kāvyālaṁkāra, 22. 3). The question of limiting *rasa* eight to nine remained a problem of defferent schools. Udbhaṭa included *śānta* as the ninth *rasa* while Daṅḍin ignored the *śānta rasa* by stating *'iha tvaṣṭarasayat smṛtagirām* (Kāvyadarśa 2.292). Same is the opinion of Dhanañajayà. Due to impractical state of presentation of *śānta rasa* he ennumerates only eight *rasas*. But Viśvanātha in his 'Sāhitya darpaṇa' deletes *preya* but including *śānta* adds *vātsalya* (love for young) as the tenth *rasa*. Since he was *chamatkāravādī* he also pleaded *adbhut* as the basis of all the *rasas*. As against this, Bhoja, calls *śṛngāra* as *rasarāja* and says that all *sthāyībhāvas* ultimately are subordinated to *rati* the permanent emotion of *śṛngāra*, In some opinions *śṛngāra* is the source of *vira*, from which origins *vibhatsa* and it causes *raudra*. But distinguishing these Dhanañjaya has accepted *śṛngāra*, *vira*, *vibhastsa* and *raudra* as the fundamental *rasas* for the reason that they react in the heart of *sāmājika* as a natural cause through the process of blossoming (vikāsa), expansion (vistāra), agitation (kṣobha and unsettlement (vikaṣepa) as the psychic force. *Hāsya*, *adbhut*, *karuṇā* and *bhayānaka* also react in the same process. The question whether *rati* (śṛngāra) or *utsāha* (vira) or *nirveda* (sānta) or *śoke* (karuṇā) or *ratis* as the *sthāyībhāva* or *bhakti* is predominant over the other is a matter of opinion, Bhoja has given top priority to *śṛngāra*, Abhinavagupta in 'Abhinavabhārati' praises *vīra* as a *rasa* which can produce all *rasas*. Bhavabhūti remarks 'eko rasaḥ karuṇā eva'. Rūpa Goswami has pleaded the superiority of *bhakti rasa*.

Rūpa Goswami in his 'Ujjvalanīlamaṇi (and 'Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu' has described the *bhakti rasa* as the most brilliant one (ujjvala). This concept is after the propogation of *śānta* as the ninth *rasa*, when devotional love became very prominent after Chaitanya. According to this theory the *mādhura rati* is the *sthāyībhāva* and its abode is the heart of the devotee, who is *sahṛdaya*. The emotion of *mādhura rati* with the association and through the process of *bibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhichāri bhāvas* fulfills the condition of a *rasa*. He does not deny the existence of other *rasas*, rather considering *śānta*, *priti*, *preyāna*, *vātsalya* and *mādhura* as five principal emotions and *hāsya*, *adbhut*, *vīra*, *karuṇā*, *raudra*, *bhayānaka* and *vibhatsa* as seven secondary emotions, thus considers twelve *rasas*—all subservient to *bhakti rasa* (bhakti raso bhedāddyyordvādasadhocchayate, Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu 8. 5. 89). It is significant that Rūpa Goswami has not mentioned *śṛṅgāra rasa*. For his devotional and thestic convenience, he has propounded the theory of *bhaktirasa*, with *rati* as the *sthāyībhāva* and on this basis all the five principal *rasas* mentioned by him i. e, *śānta*, *prīti*. *preyāna*, *vātsalya* and *mādhura* actually are the manifestations to the same emotion (rati) and constitute *bhakti rasa*.

But his theory is significant in one way that the theoretical catagorization of emotions and experience has been a growing concept in Indian aesthetics. It is also to be observed that against the view of grouping the *rasas* and emotions whether eight or more, there have been several objections too, Rudraṭa has most potently raised this objection and has stated that there is no emotion in human heart, which is incapable of reaching the status of *rasa*. Ānandavardhana also has stated that whatever emotions and the human experiences are, can reach the level of *rasa* in the heart of a *sahṛdaya* or *sāmājika* if they are capable of affecting the *chitta* by way of *druti*, *dīpti* and *vikāsa*. Thus it is suggested that any experience can enter the aesthetic realm if conditioned and processed by *anubhāva* etc.

The theoretical process of cooking the *rasa* (rasa praripāka) is analogus to medicinal process. But the process as conceived in aesthetic content is described briefly as below :—

The *sthāyībhava*, dominating emotion or the ruling passion blossoms into *rasa* (a relishable aesthetic mood and experience) when it is hightened and intesified by *vibhāvas*, the principal and stimulating causes i. e. *ālaṁbana vibhāvas* as well as the accessory stimulating causes, known as *uddīpana vibhavas. Ālaṁbanabhāva* is the chief basis of the *rasa*. It refers to the hero or heroine (in drama) or in the art objects such as images and paintings. *Uddīpana vibhāvas* are the factors intesifying the *rasa* such as the natural setting. The other stimulating factor is *anubhāva* which is external manifestotions of *bhāva* in the hero, such as his sidelong glances, smiles etc. They are physical factors which bring the *sthāyībhāvas* into the plane of the working consciousness. It is the indicator of the emotional situation through the physical manifestations (anubhāvo vikārastu bhāvasmsūchanātmakaḥ). The *sāttivika bhāvas* are significantly discussed by Bharata etc. They are certain prominent physical effects of feeling. It is a significant constituent of *rasa*. It refers to that mental attitude which identifies person with the joys and the sorrows of others, The *sāttivikabhāvas* are enummerated as passivity, loss of consciousness, horripilation, sweating, loss of brightness. tremor, tears and change of tone. (Staṁbhapralayoromāñchāḥ svedo vaivarṇyavepathū, aśruvaisvaryamitaṣṭatau). There elements of *rasa* together with *vyabhichāri bhāvas*, which are ever changing and ever rising and ever setting minor collateral feelings of pleasure and pain cause the *rasa*. They are thirty-three in number and in nature they are like waves on the ocean of the *sthayībhāvas* (kallola eva vāridhau). Satiety, langour, apprehensiveness, weariness, mental repose, deadness of faculties, exaltation, depression, sternness, anxiety, fear, jealousy, anger, arrogance, memory, collapse, vanity, dream, sleep, wakefulness, bashfulness, possession of evil spirits, stupor, prudence, indolence, agitation, ratiocination, disstimulation, mental pain, delirrium, despair, impatience and indecision are the *vyabhichāribhavas*. The permanent aesthetic mood (sthāyibhāvas) blends the various accessory moods (unless they are thoroughly contrary to it) into a greater and intenser totality. This theoretical complexity of procedure ultimately leads to pure aesthetic experience to be distinguished with ordinary experience of pleasure and pain. The Indian theorists of experience neither consider an object which does not contain *rasa* as art-object nor any experience as aesthetic experience which is devoid of *rasa*.[33] Not only the ordinary experience, even the isolated factors by itself are not sufficient to create the aesthetic situation congeneal for the birth of *rasa*. Bharata compares it to the individual flavour which emerges from the dish made of many ingredients, each contributing its own taste, yet permeating an unique flavour unlike any which belongs to the ingredients separately. These ingredients in the aesthetic situation belongs not to the objects alone, nor to subject alone, a combination of both forces are necessary for the aesthetic emotion to take birth. For the creation of *rasa* it is indeed extremely important to maintain this balance.

Thus, the theory of Bharata is firm on the point that all emotions and empathies as the primary feeling depend on the object can constitute *rasa.* The contained factors presented objectively by an art work, the images etc. in drama for instance, in the form of drammatic characters, costumes, scenery, movement and action and those subjective reactions with these factors evoke in the spectator. Only out of the determinants, (vibhāva), consequent (anubhāva) and transitory mental states (vyabhichārins) the birth of *rasa* takes place. *Rasa* is not an ordinary feeling though constituted of the same material. It bears all the characteristics of actual feeling, yet it is free from its adverse effects; consequently it is essentially and invariably pleasurable. It is achieved when every day feelings (bhāvas) are purified on one hand through the medium of art, and on the other hand through the imaginative faculty of spectator.[34] *Rasa* is neither a mental construct nor a logical entity but a purified entity of aesthetics. There is a kind of psychical distance from real in the realm of the aesthetic experience. The pleasurable aesthetic joy is at a distance from the selfish joy, the direct consequence of an ordinary experience of joy and sorrows of usual life. The peculiar aesthetic situation, though the natural outcome of the similar causes does not bear upon the person directly or enjoy individually and what in normal circumstance one would might have suffered passively due to usual motivative causes. But in relation to the aesthetic experience, whether the cause is direct or immediate, the situation created by the art-work presents not an actual but an apparent situation. It cannot effect as in the same way as one has undergone in the real life. But even though the aesthetic emotion is part of an art situation, and in a sense, removed from the domain of practical life, it establishes a direct connection with the spectation in a peculiar aesthetic situation for the basis of experience remains the same. 'Feeling is aroused in the spectator despite the unrealistic situation created by the art-work, because he possesses inherently those feelings and emotions which are being depicted, he has at the same time or another undergone them fully. 'With all the good or bad effects which generally accompany such feelings, hence in a created aesthetic situation and moment, he lives in the former experience, not through memory but through aesthetic participation. This experience is not merely empathy but what we can call figuratively *charvāṇaṁ* i. e. living through'.[35] The point of difference between the two lies in the fact that the former is merely the first hand experience, and also objective and independent and the latter is a matter of universal relish in which there is no scope for egoistic self (āvaraṇa) obstructing the purification of aesthetic experience. The ordinary emotion of the first hand experience directly derived from physical fact or event, when purified through the process of aesthetic determinants creats an objective situation acceptable as universal experience in the form of generalized experience, to be difined as *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*, which according to Abhinavagupta is the essence or universal effect of *rasa* imploying two-fold process of impersonalisation and identification of objectification and a subjective experience. In this there is aesthetically actual participation within the calculated aesthetic situation. How a personal experience becomes impersonal—is explained by R. Gnoli[36] who defines generality (sādhāraṇa) as a state of self-identification with the imagined situation, devoid of any practical interest and from this point of view, of any relation whatever, with the limited self and as it were impersonal. Thus the experience evoked by the work of art are purely transpersonal, but the spectator re-lives in this experience, feeling it as the revival of ones own experience (sva eva svadate).

Determination of nature of aesthetic experience has been defined as a variable nature. Bharata explaining *āsvāda* has compared the aesthetic pleasure with the taste enjoyed in the world by the food (vyañjana). The worldly pleasure while may also be a kind of adverse undesirable experience (pratikūlavedanīyaṁ), the aesthetic pleasure is purely pleasurable (anukūlavedanīyaṁ). Bharata considers the culumination of all emotions into happiness (harṣa). Thus he catagorically says 'sāmājikānām hi herṣaphalaṁ na śokādiphalaṁ. Abhinavagupta considering the aesthetic experience as joyus (prahlādanātmaka) says that in aesthetic experience one enjoys one's own self (svātmāparāmarṣa), which is self illuminating and intensified bliss (ānandaghana rūpa).[37] No where in the 'Nāṭyaśāstra', Bharata has defined the aesthetic experience in term of *alaukika*, *anirvachanīya* or *lokottara*. Supra-sensual or altogether unworldly experience of art is a later conceptual innovation. Ānandavardhans *alokasāmānya* is the attribute of artistic creation, but its experience has not been defind as 'unworldly'. The 'dhanivādī' theorists indicate the nature of aesthetic experience embodied in the suggested part of artistic expression, In the light of *dhvani* theory 'union of the permanent mood with the *vibhāvas* through the relation of of the suggested (vyaṅgya) and the suggestor (vyañjaka); and that the 'niṣpatti' should mean *abhivyakti*.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka was the first to consider the aesthetic experience in the 'extraordinary' rather than the 'usual' term of experience. But it is sponteneous and a perennial experience of art, to be enjoyed by one's own self (svagata pratīta). He further says that due to the process involved in generalisation (sādhāraṇīkaraṇa) the experience becomes not only extraordinary but also unworldly (lokottara rasa prāṇake hṛdaya samvādavaśāt).[38]

Abhinavagupta has totally rejected to consider the aesthetic experience as 'laukika pratyakṣa' to be expressed in the calculated meaning. It does not always depend on cause and effect and also not expressible in so many words. Verbal meaning (kāvyārtha) when tinged with internal emotion (vāsanā) of *sahṛdaya* almost transforms the reaction in the heart and mind (chittavṛtti) and in that even one's own experience in the past appears with speciality (vilakṣaṇatā).

This experience which is not expressive (avācchya) and also not constituted in the 'abhidhā i. e. directly related with words and meaning' being the matter of fact experience such as the statement informing 'the birth of a son'. This matter of fact statement that a son is born to you (puttrastejātaḥ) through pleasurable is not the aesthetic expression, for the meaning alone is valid. In the aesthetic experience the meaning in expression is not fixed and determined. It requires more factors (vibhāvādi) to constitute the experience of *rasa*.[30]

Mahimabhaṭṭa following Śaṅkuka has considered the aesthetic experience as comparable (anumeya) with the wordly pleasure or simple pleasure and it is derived in has very nature of the poetic theme and artistic subject (vastusvabhāva). Since the joy of artistic pleasure is filtered through poetic or artistic creation, it is somewhat different and extra-ordinary (vilakṣaṇa). It is intensified due to the inherent nature of artistic creation (tanmayībhāva yuktaḥ).[40] The transformation of direct experience through poetic or artistic creation is responsible for this refined and sublime experience. But the experience itselfis pleasurable. It is *alaukika* only in the sense that the artistic pleasure is not totally dependent on the cause and effect of daily life; it is through artistic medium and filtered. It is impersonal and not personal. Since the objective of art itself is the universal joy (lokānurañjana, as Bhoja says in his 'Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa' it is due to very nature of creation not unworldly (Samastalokarañjakatvamityanena alaukikatāṁ pariharaṇa).[41]

Summerising the view of Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa has defined the nature of aesthetic experience as derived due to articulated situation of art object, which is not real, appears to be real in the experience of a *sahṛdaya* whose feeling is roused by the remote aesthetic consequences of emotion, which is already present in him as *sthāyībhāvas* such as *ratyādi*, The pre--existant emotions in the *sahṛdaya* when experienced are really unworldly experience obviously because it is not due to any casual relationship of worldly plane and the experience itself is impersonal and self manifest (svasamavedana siddha). The aesthetic experience is not due to any worldly, sensual or logical phenomenon.[43]

The later theorists like Viśvanātha and Jagannātha have placed the aesthetic experience in terms of *rasānubhūti* to the level of spiritual intensified experience such as *Brahmānanda* ete. particularly because the aesthetic experience in its own is un–experienced and unseen and unheard (adṛṣṭa pūrva etc.). Viśvanātha determines the aesthetic experience as not imaginary but true though unworldly (alaukikaṁ satyaṁ vedyaḥ).[43] Thus, he says that the aesthetic experience (rasa) is rising from the exultations of the *sattvaguṇa*. This experience as noted above is infinite (akhaṇḍa) and full of self–luminous bliss and consciousness (svaprakāśānanda chinmayaḥ) It is also free from the taint of any other intruding mental act (vedyāntara sparsa śūnyo) and akin to the experience of Divine Bliss (Brahmasvādasahodaraḥ).

But this aesthetic experience cannot be enjoyed by a person of an ordinary calabour and understanding. It is enjoyed by those whose soul is transcendent charm (lokottarachamatkāra prāṇa) and is happy and fortunate. In this sort of enjoyment and pleasureoble expereience there is unity of enjoyer and and enjoed and also the enjoyment itself (svākāravadbhinnatvenāyamāsvadyate rasaḥ).

Jagannātha has pleaded that the aesthetic experience is not the function of mind but it is the luminous manifestation the conscious self (svaprakāśa of ātmachaitanya). The soul (ātmā) is luminous, which is real (satya) in relation to other *padārthas*, which are not only unreal but also derive the light by the everlit soul and its bliss (nitya and prakāśānanda). While all other experiences are unreal and they are the manifestation of the unreal self of *paramātmā* it is only the aesthetic experience which is real for it is the manifestation of the ones own and real as well as the luminous self. Therefore the aesthetic experience is permanent (nitya) self—luminous (svaprakāśa) and supra--sensual (alaukika). The fulfillment of this extra-ordinary experience is in the supreme bliss.

References

1. Supra, pp. 109–110. ch. VII
2. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II p. 26.
3. Supra, p. 20–21
4. Supra., p, 38. 97, 125–126.
5. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II p. 158.
6. Tolestoy. *What is art*, p. 50.
7. Ibid., pp. 56, 156.
8. Ruskin, 'Oxford Lecturcs, quoted in E. F. Carritt. *The Theory of Beauty*. p. 43.
9. Supra, p. 8.
10. *Comperatlve Aesthetics*, Vol. II. pp 222–223.
11. Supra, pp. 10, 41, Infra pp. 168, 187, 188.
12. Supra. pp. 33–44.
13. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II. pp. 240–241.
14. Ibid., p. 339–345.
15. Compare, Supra, p. 33.
16. *The Theory of Beauty*, p. 107.
17. *Comperative Aesthetics*, Vol. II pp. 393–394.
18. B. Croce, *Aesthetics*, p. 78.
19. Ibid., p. 78.
20. *Vāma*. *R. V.* 5. 82. 6; 8. 22. 18; 8. 103. 5 etc. *Chārutva*. Ibid., 10. 70. 9.
21. Geooge Santayana, *Sense of Beauty*. Pts. II to IV.
22. Supra. pp. 124–128
23. Supra, p. 123
24. S. N. Das Gupta, *Fundamentals of Indian Art*., pp. 102–108.
25. Supra, p. 125
26. .*R. V*. 10 71. 7.
27. Abhinavagupta on '*Nātyaśāstra*, p. 280
28. *Sankrit Poetics as a study of Aesthetics*, p. 31.
29. *Daśarūpaka*., p. 278.

30 Ibid., p. 283.

31. *Nātyaśāstra*, Chs. VI–VIII.
32. Ibid., pp. 288–289.
33. Raniero Gnoli *Aesthetics Experience according to Abhinavagupa*, p. 29,

34. Ibid., p. 39.
35, Ibid., pp 34–35.
36. *Aesthetic Experience according to Abhivavagupta*, p. 51.
37. *Abhinava Bhārati*, p. 289.
38. Ibid., p. 36.
39. Ibid., pp. 284–285.
40. *Vyaktiviveka*, Ch. I. pp 12–14
41. '*Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*, Vol. II. p. 472.
42. *Kāvya Prakāśa*, Ch. IV.
43. *Sāhitya Darpaṇa*, III. 26.

INDEX

ābhāsa 8, 40, 108
abhidhā 11, 19, 174, 186
Abhinavagupta 15, 17, 19, 44, 175-176, 179, 185, 187
abhivyakti 154, 186, (see expression)
āchārya 176
adhikārin 177
ākāra 31 (See Form also);
aesthetic bliss 42, 43 (See ānanda, paramānanda also)
  — and experience 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 44,
  — 45, 175-188 (See experience also)
  — and metaphysics 5, Western–43, Indian–
  — 43–66
  — and morality 167
  — and perception 8, 31, 42
  — imagination 31
  — nature in śilpa texts 53-74, in Bṛhatsaṁhitā 68; in the Jain anthologies 71–72; in the Purāṇas 58, 63-67, in Śukraniti 72–75; in the Vaiṣṇava Āgamas and Saṁhitās 68–70
  — transcendental nature of 10, 45 (See alaukika, lokottara)
  — religion 3–11
  — religious sensibility 7
alaṁkāra 15, 16, 21, 23–25, 92
  — and beauty 175–6
alaukika 43, 187
amūrta 37, 39
ānanda 8, 11, 17, 41 (See Brahmānand, Parmānanda, Ātmānanda 43, Chidānanda 15, 16, 17, 21, 161, 176, 186
anauchiiya 23
anukṛti 7, 145 (See imitation also)
anumāna 9
anurūpa 33
Appayadīkṣita 24, 170
Architecture
  — defcets 97, 98 (See vāstudoṣa)
  — organic concept of, 60, 88, 98
  — principles of, 100
  — qualities of, 92, 99, 102
  — symbolism of, 92, 100
Aristotle 43, 135, 136
art and ritual 7, 74–75
artha 11, 15, 19, 21
auchitya in relation of beauty 173
Beauty 3, 5, 139, 140, 161, 169–170, 175, 187–188
  — as *auchitya* 173
  — concept of beauty (Indian) 169–173
  — concept of beauty (Western) 161–168 Socrates 161, Plato 161, Aristotle 162–163, Plotinus 163–164, Tolestoy 165, Heagel 165, Descartes 166, Locke 166, Addition 166, Barkley 166, Croce 46, 168–169
  — denominations of, 7, 8, 32, 73, 74, 103, 169, 170, 171, 174, 175
  — elements of, 162
  — external features of, 171–172
  — nature of, 175
  — as intellectual experience 166
  — as *Chamatkāra* 173–174
  — as *ramaṇīyatā* 175
  — as *rasa* 173
  — as primary quest 1
  — in relation to *auchitya* 173
  — relation to *chamatkāra* 173, 174, 187–188
  — in relation to *Chamatkāra* 173–174, 187–188
  — in relation to *dhvani* 175

— in relation to image 169
— as expression (abhivyakti) 164, 169, 173
— as absolute expression 163, 164
— beauty and form 173
— beauty and morality
— beauty and perfection 167
— beauty and preference 172, 176–177
— beauty and sublime 167
— beauty and virtue 165
— sense of beauty 140, 169
Bhāmaha 21, 23, 24, 175
Bharata 15, 16, 21, 65, 179–181, 183, 184, 186
Bhaṭṭalollaṭa 16
Bhaṭṭanāyaka 16, 17, 186
bhāva 16, 18, 38, 44, 67, 73 (See feeling also)
Bhavabhūti 181
Bhoja 181, 187
Bhogin (as consumer) 137
Brahma 5, 10, 11 (as nāda-Brahma 5; as rasa-Brahma 10)
Brahmānanda 5, 10, 11, 17, 187
Chakravarti 56, 66, 146
Chāravāka 8
Chārutā (also chārutva) 32, 169
Chamatkāra 173–174
Chitrva (as sculpture) 107, 108
Chitrābhāsa (as painting) 107, 108
chitrādha or ardhachitra 107, 108
Chitta 8, 9, 31, 38, 40, 43, 145
Croce 6, 46, 168, 169
Daṇḍin 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 72, 74, 142, 175
Dhanañjaya 179, 181
dhvani 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 174–177, 186
dhyāna 8, 24, 38, 40, 41, 45
dik-sādhana 93, 94
doṣa—ten poetic doṣas 21–22, in architecture 97–98, in painting 175, in relation to expression 177
emotion 184, 186
experience
— abode of, 178
— absolute 6, 9, 44, 45
— aesthetic 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 44, 45, 175–188
— determinants of, 185
— levels of, 176
— nature of, 178, 179, 182, 185, 187–188
— as Brahmasvādana 11
— as *rasānubhūti* 15, 17, 187–188
— as transcendental 10, 42, 44, 45, 186
expression 164, 169, 177–178, 186
— beauty of, 177
— flawless 169
— mode of, 178
feeling (aesthetic) 31–33
form 36, 44, 45, 135, 144 146–155
— aesthetic form 138–139
— articulation of, 145–147
— classification of, 143
— content of, 139–140
— divine 147-152
— elements of, 135
— evolution of, 139
— expression of, 140
— figuration 35–36
— idealization of, 140
— in relation to beauty 140
— in relation to matter 139, 140–141
— manifestation of, 146–147
— principles of, 138-139
— socially conditional form 151–155
— style and form 140, 143
— symbolic form 140, 143
guṇa 9, 20, 24, 67, 74, 75
— ten poetic 20, 21, 22, 142
— three elements 42
— eight of painting 125
Heagel 6, 44, 93, 168
Hemachandra 24
Idea 135–138
imagination 31
image 144
denomination of, 144
transformation of idea into, 171-172

imitation 161, 168, (see anukṛti)
intention 34–37, 136, 137
Jagannātha 10, 24, 43, 175, 187, 188
Jain Anthology 71
Jayadeva 24
Kālidāsa 170, 181
Kāma 34, 37
Kant 43
Karṇa 15, 67
Kāvyaśarīra 19, 26
Kauśala 137
Koṣa 41–42
Kṣayavṛddhi 67, 102
Kuntal 174
Kuntaka 23
lakṣaṇa 19, 174
Leibniz 43
Leonardo 102
Lock 166
lokāyat 8
lokasādṛṣya 107, 110
lokottara 166
mahāpramāṇa 55
Mahimabhaṭṭa 22, 23, 186
Mallinātha 24
Mammaṭa 10, 25, 173, 187
manasa 9
mārga 19, 25
matter-progressive realization of, 34, 43
mudrā 65
mūrta 33, 34
Nāda-Brahma 5
Nagnajit 27, 107
padadevatā 57, 81–89
padārtha (dravya) 9
painting aṅgas (eight) of, 126–127
  — brush 122
  — Chinese concept of, 128–130
  — classification of, 108, 110–112
  — colour 119–122
  — defects of, 125–126
  — instances 115–117
  — medium of, 110
  — origin of, 108–109
  — pictoral effect 125–126
  — principles of, 109
  — qualities of, 125
  — six limbs of, 127–130, 143
  (Indian concept of ṣaḍaṅga)
  — technical aspects of, 118–124
  — thems of, 109
Pāṇini 24
pañjara (also khilapañjara) 79
paramānanda 5, 187
parokṣa 39, 145
pāṭava 74
Plato 43, 161
Plotinus 43
prāṇapratiṣṭhā 7
prāsāda 68, 69
pratibimba 9, 38
pratimālakṣaṇa 58, 102, 103
pratirūpa 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 46
  — duality of *pratirūpa* 33
  — mānasī *pratirūpa* 34
pratyakṣa 8, 39, 145–146
puruṣa 9, 10
Rājaśekhara 24
ramaṇīyatā 18, 73
ramya 74, 103
rasa 8–11, 15, 16, 18, 23, 92, 179–188
  — as *Brahma svādana* 5, 11, 186, 187
  — as experience (*anubhnti*) 15, 17, 186-189
  — as *laukika pratyakṣa* 186
  — as unworldly experience 44–45
  — as supream bliss 188
  — as *vastusvabhāva* 187
  — kind of *rasa* 180–181
  — nature of *rasa* 179–181
  — theoretical process of *rasa* 182–184
rasika 177, 178, 180
rīti 19, 20, 142
  — as element of beauty 175

Rodin 103
Rudraṭa 29, 181
rūpa 31–36, 55, 67, 79, 135
  — relation to chitta 38–42
Rūpagoswāmī 181
Ruyyaka 24–25
ṣaḍaṅga 126–130, 143
Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa 18, 19, 125, 128
sādṛśya 8, 66, 67, 144, 145, 155
  — *lokasādṛśya* 107, 145
sahṛdaya 19, 167–179 (see also rasika), 176
sakhā (as connoisseur) 32, 46
sāmājika 185, 186
Sanatayana G. 185, 186
Saṅkarāchārya 10, 40, 41,
Saṅkuka 16, 186
Schopenhauer 45
sculpture 102, 103
  — as chitra 107
śilpa 4, 33, 34, 52–54, 57–58, 79
  — devaśilpa 33
  — mānasī śilpa 33, 34, 166
  — nature of *śilpa* in Arthaśāstra 54–55, Āgamas 68–69, Agni Purāṇa 62–64, Bṛhatsaṁhitā 57–68, digests 70, Manasāra 81–84, Matsya Purāṇa 59–62, Śukranīti 72–75, Tantras 70, Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa 64
  — nature of *śilpavidyā* 52–54, 57–58, 79, 84
similitude 144–146
śobhā (beauty) 73–74
sthānas (instances) 65, 67, 115–117
sthāyībhāva 183, 187
style 140–142
  — as rīti 142
sublime 167, 168
svabhāvokti 23
tālamāna 55, 58, 61, 65, 66, 73, 94–95, 113–115, 144
thara 89
tritattava 5
types of men (Haṁsa, Bhadra, Mālavya, Ruchaka, Śaśaka) 65, 112–115
types of temples 95–114
ugly 167
  —*upamā* 24
upamāna 9
upameya 24
Vāgbhaṭa 24
vāk 15
vakrokti 23
vāma (beauty) 32
Vāmana 20, 21, 24, 169
vāsanā 18
Vastu (in relation to beauty) 175–176
Vāstu-Brahma
vāstudoṣa 97–98
  - *guṇa*
vāstupūjā 7
Vāstu Puruṣa 5, 57
Vāstu-Puruṣa-maṇḍala 81, 84, 85
vāstuśāstraupadeṣṭā 51–53
vāstuvidyā 79–92
verisimilitude 166
viccakṣaṇa 95–97, 142
Vimāna 95, 97, 142
Viśvanātha 24, 25, 42, 142, 174, 175, 181, 187
vṛtti 19
vyabhichāribhāva 183
yantra 147
yāska 23
yoga 40, 72
